

6774. Also, resolution adopted by the Vessel Owners and Captains' Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against passage of the bill (H. R. 10887) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River at or near Wilmington, Del.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6775. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution of the Post Office Square Club of New York City, earnestly requesting Congress to enact into law the La Follette-Kendall short Saturday workday bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6776. By Mr. GARNER of Oklahoma: Petition of American Association of University Women, Milwaukee, Wis., in support of the Goodwin bill, H. R. 10574; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6777. Also, petition of Red Ball Bus Co., Enid, Okla., making protest against portion of Parker bus bill permitting competing license to be issued for bus lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6778. Also, petition of executive board of the Oklahoma City Junior League, urging support of House bill 9042; to the Committee on the Library.

6779. Also, petition of Oklahoma Forest Commission, Oklahoma City, urging support of tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6780. Also, petition of Farm Seed Association of America, Chicago, Ill., in opposition to increased tariff on alsike clover seed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6781. Also, petition of Long-Bell Lumber Co., Longview, Wash., urging support of tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6782. Also, petition of Long-Bell Lumber Co., Ames, Okla., in support of tariff on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6783. By Mr. HOWARD: Petition signed by Sam Martinson and 41 others of Maskell, Nebr., and vicinity, pleading for passage of House bill 2562, now pending before the Congress, which bill provides for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish-American War. The 41 other persons are as follows: Ludwig Nedergaard, Oscar Klanderud, H. Bengtson, Ludwig Stolpe, F. M. Schmid, William Nielsen, J. P. Christensen, K. P. Jensen, Ira Cook, Scott Grantham, C. A. Leocimore, and Emanuel Stolpe, of Obert; Alfred R. Olsen, Emil Gunderson, H. J. Lenzen, J. C. Johnson, Lewis Curbenson, P. A. Anderson, C. E. Gee, Jacob Nielson, Ole B. Gunderson, W. H. Gee, Arthur Lukken, Charles G. Johnson, O. C. Harang, O. N. Lukken, J. C. Sorensen, Sam Werger, H. W. Cooke, Oscar Bensen, Nels Birklen, Ole B. Flom, Minor Flom, G. C. Hausman, M. P. Lund, M. H. Wyant, Neal A. Maskell, Ed Whitsett, and Andrew Nelson, of Maskell; A. Lund and Otto C. Johnson, of Hartington, State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Pensions.

6784. By Mr. MILLIGAN: Petition of citizens of Lexington and Wellington, Mo., urging the enactment of legislation granting additional benefits to veterans of the Spanish War and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

6785. By Mr. MOREHEAD: Petition signed by Hon. Clanda Barnell and many others, asking Congress to pass Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, for relief of the Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

6786. By Mr. NELSON of Maine: Petition of 25 citizens of Maine, urging increased Spanish War pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

6787. By Mr. WALKER: Petition of Thomas H. Shyrock and others, urging the enactment of the Johnson bill and other legislation relative to World War veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6788. By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of various business interests, favoring the passage of the Norris bill for the development of Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1930

(Legislative day of Monday, April 14, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 686. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910;

S. 3473. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 16, 1926, establishing a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes;

S. 3747. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near the mouth of Clarks River;

S. 4027. An act to legalize a bridge across the American Channel of the Detroit River leading from the mainland to Grosse Isle, Mich., and about 16 miles below the city of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 8960. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9183. An act to provide for the exercise of sole and exclusive jurisdiction by the United States over the Hawaii National Park in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9442. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make engineering and economic investigations and studies of conditions in Palo Verde and Cibola Valleys and vicinity on the Colorado River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9637. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Champlain at or near Rouses Point, N. Y., and a point at or near Alburg, Vt.; and

H. R. 10173. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of cotton ginning.

### SENATORIAL EXPENSES IN 1930 CAMPAIGN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH] has asked to be excused from service on the special committee appointed to investigate campaign expenditures in the 1930 campaign. Without objection, his request will be granted, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] to succeed him.

Mr. BINGHAM subsequently said: Mr. President, during my absence from the Chamber this morning the Vice President appointed me to membership on the special committee investigating campaign expenditures in the 1930 campaign. I regret that this was done without consultation with me. Some time ago I accepted an appointment from the President as chairman of the American Samoan Commission, which must go to American Samoa this year—it should have gone last year—to carry out the provisions of the law providing for a study of conditions there and recommendations for an organic act. In view of the fact that the special committee to which I have been appointed must hold meetings during the summer, and the impossibility of being in two places at once, I must ask to be relieved of service on the special committee. I hereby tender my resignation.

### PRESERVATION OF SCENIC BEAUTY OF NIAGARA FALLS

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the President sent to the Senate a few days ago a report of the special International Niagara Board. It has some relation to a treaty with Canada now pending in the Senate. The President asked in his communication that the same be published as a public document. I am authorized by the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask unanimous consent that the same be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PETITION

Mr. GILLET presented a petition of citizens of the town of Essex, Mass., praying that the John Wise House, so called, and some 100 acres of adjoining land located in the north end district of the township be acquired and preserved as a monument to the "Father of American Independence," and to mark the birthplace of American freedom, to be known as the John Wise National Memorial, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

### CATAWBA INDIANS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Charlotte Observer of Sunday, April 13, 1930, relating to the condition of the Catawba Indians of South Carolina; also an editorial from the same paper of the same date relating to the same subject. I ask that the article and the editorial may be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs because of their value in the consideration of matters pending before that committee relating to these Indians.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, Sunday, April 13, 1930]

#### THE CATAWBAS

Nine miles from Rock Hill, in South Carolina, is the land of the Catawbas. It is a desolate land. On it there are no forests and hardly any trees. The terrain is hilly and rocky and too poor to sustain human life. The best white farmers in the Carolinas would starve to death thereon. The remnant of the Catawba Indians is facing virtual starvation. There are no more pitiful people on the face of the earth than these Indians, who are now holding out appealing hands to the Great White Father in Washington to come to their relief.

This proud and valiant race has been always the consistent friend of the white man. In the early days they interposed their power between the settlements in South Carolina and the fierce Cherokees to the west. The Catawbas have taken part in every war in which the United States has engaged. They fought for the Confederacy in the War between the States. A number of their young men volunteered for service in the World War, and at least one of them was sent overseas. At Fort Mill there stands a monument to the valor of the red men who followed the fortunes of Lee and Jackson.

The Catawbas are a vanishing tribe of a vanishing race. There are now only 172 individuals on their reservation. There are only 6 full-bloods of this once virile people in the world to-day. These are old men and women who can no longer hope for a perpetuation of their race. The journey of the Catawbas into the land of the to-morrows is inevitable. It is a pity. Of all the Indians on the American Continent these have been the most faithful in their allegiance to their white neighbors.

But the whites have not treated them with the consideration they deserve. The Catawbas relinquished 144,000 acres of land to the State of South Carolina, of which 625 acres was returned to them for a reservation. There is no more barren territory in the State than this. Nothing will grow on their rocky hillsides. If they turn over their thin soil the rains wash it into the river. There are no longer deer in the forests for their sustenance. There are no longer any forests or any trees for firewood. The pollution of the white man has killed the fish in the deep pools of their turbulent river.

The Catawbas are the wards of the State of South Carolina. The legislative appropriation for their maintenance amounts to \$28 per annum per individual. There is no fertility in their land. They must live on this pittance or die. Some of them eke out a bare existence in the industrial centers. But the Indian is designed for a life in the open. He can not survive under the white man's civilization. He can not secure proper nourishment for his children. The rain comes in through his dilapidated roof and wets him in the night.

Recently a subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, acting on a resolution introduced by Senator COLE L. BLEASE, visited the Catawba Reservation and made a first-hand study of the condition of these Indians. They found the situation even worse than they had been led to believe. They found families crowded together under inadequate roofs, with nothing to eat but a pone of bread held together with water and seasoned with a little salt. It is believed they will recommend that Congress do something about it. It is to be hoped that this is so. The Catawbas have waited a long time for the white people in whom they trusted to repay their trust.

Petitions have been presented to the Legislature of South Carolina on behalf of these Indians from time to time for the last 100 years. While the State has not turned a deaf ear to them, adequate provision has not been made for the prevention of want and destitution among them. The towns of Rock Hill and Fort Mill are said to be built upon land surrendered by these Indians under long-term leases that were never fulfilled. Even as far back as the Revolutionary period, the Catawbas realized the destiny that was confronting them. In that far day, one Peter Harris—and the name of Harris is still prominent in the annals of the Catawbas—presented a pathetic appeal to the young Republic that will bear repetition here, because it is as true essentially to-day as it was when delivered before the legislature:

"I am one of the lingering survivors of an almost extinguished race. Our graves will soon be our habitations. I am one of the few stalks that still remain in the field after the tempest of the Revolution is passed. I fought the British for your sake. The British have disappeared, nor have I gained by their defeat. I pursued the deer for a subsistence; the deer are disappearing, and I must starve. God ordained me for the forest, and my ambition is for the shade. But the strength of my arm decays, and my feet fall me in the chase. The hand which fought the British for your liberties is now open for your relief. In my youth I bled in battle that you might be independent. Let not my heart in my old age bleed for the want of your commiseration."

Surely Congress will see to it that these people are taken care of for as long as there are any of them remaining. It will not be for a long period. They ask only for the right to live—that their young men may gain a livelihood by the sweat of their brows and that the older ones may walk into the setting sun with hearts at peace.

[From the Charlotte Observer, Sunday, April 13, 1930]

LAST OF CATAWBAS APPEAL TO GREAT WHITE FATHER—STARVATION AND EXTINCTION FACING ONCE POWERFUL TRIBE REDUCED TO ACTUAL POVERTY—CATAWBAS HAVE FOUGHT ON SIDE OF WHITES IN EVERY WAR IN WHICH AMERICA HAS ENGAGED—ONLY ONE WHITE MAN EVER KNOWN TO HAVE BEEN KILLED BY THEM—SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THEM WITH VIEW TO PROVIDING RELIEF IN THEIR EXTREMITY

By Ernest S. Dreher

Consistent friends of the white man, with a record of service in every war in which the United States has engaged, the once-powerful Catawba Indians, reduced in numbers almost to the vanishing point, condemned to live on lands so poor that it does not afford them a livelihood, unable to secure relief from the State of South Carolina, whose wards they are, are making a final appeal to the Government at Washington to save them from extinction.

#### TOO MUCH CIVILIZATION

Their forests felled that the white people might build houses in which to live, their lands taken from them under long-term leases that were never fulfilled, the fish in the great river named for them killed through the pollution of the white man, restricted to living on a barren area on a rocky hillside, the Indians who stood between the settlements in South Carolina and the fierce Cherokees on the west, unable to succor their sick or decently bury their dead, hold out appealing hands to the Great Father of their white neighbors.

There are only 172 Catawba Indians left in all the world. Of this number there are only six full-bloods remaining. These are too old now to hope for a continuation of the strain that was once a proud and haughty race. Inevitably the Catawbas must journey into the land of the to-morrows. They ask now only for the necessities of life—only that their young men may be given opportunity to live by the sweat of their brows, and the older ones allowed to die with hearts at peace.

#### FRIENDS OF THE WHITE

In all the long history of the Catawbas only one white man is known to have been killed by them. They are the original prohibitionists in America. The great King Haigler in the very early days petitioned the governor at Charleston to prevent the sale of fire water to steal away the hearts and the brawn of his young men. They gave up their lands in confidence that their white friends would deal fairly with them.

No longer are there deer to be slain in the leafy forests. No longer are there fish in the pools of the rushing river. The Catawba stands desolate upon the hills of his fathers and watches the sun of his existence go down into the west.

The appropriation for the maintenance of these people by the State of South Carolina is pitifully small. When their school teacher, their physician, their undertaker, and their agent have been paid there is left only \$28 per individual to be distributed among the tribesmen. Their reservation is but a strata of rock with a thin soil on top of it. Nothing worth while can be made to grow thereon. There is no more desolate and worthless area in the State of South Carolina than the 652 acres allotted to the Catawbas as a reservation. In a land overflowing with milk and honey these people can not find enough to eat to keep their bodies in health.

#### BLEASE RESOLUTION

In a resolution offered in the Senate of the United States on February 26, COLE L. BLEASE, former Governor of South Carolina, called attention to the condition of these people, reduced now to a tribe of 88 families, of which 41 are men, 38 women, and 93 children, and asked that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized and requested to make investigation of the Catawba Indians and "report thereon with such recommendations as the committee may deem best for the interests of this tribe." Thus broke the first ray of hope through the clouds of despair that have encompassed the Catawbas about for many generations.

The subcommittee that came down to visit the reservation was composed of Senators LYNN J. FRAZIER, of North Dakota, chairman, and ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma. Both of these come from States in which Indians are domiciled, and they thus have first-hand knowledge of the life and environment of the red men. Their findings and recommendations will be regarded as authoritative. Efforts have been made in the past to interest the United States Government to take over and provide for these people, but this is the first time that an official visit has been made to them by representatives of the American Government.

#### TALK OF THE CATAWBAS

Prior to the introduction of his resolution, Senator BLEASE wrote to Gov. John G. Richards for authoritative information regarding the Catawbas. This communication was referred by the governor to T. O. Flowers, of Rock Hill, financial agent of the State for the Indians, who prepared in answer thereto a succinct account of the actual condition of these wards of the State. This summary relates in barest outline just how desolate and distressing the situation really is. It recalls briefly the essential facts leading up to the decline in prestige and power of the Catawba nation.



"During the past few years," says Mr. Flowers, "the condition of these people has become so noticeable that citizens of the State have become interested, and a feeling of sympathy and good wishes has gone out to them. The 652 acres of land they now occupy was given back to them of the 144,000 acres deeded by them to the State of South Carolina. This 652 acres comprises the present reservation. The land is situated on the Catawba River, about 9 miles from Rock Hill.

#### NONPRODUCTIVE LAND

"This land is almost nonproductive, due to the fact that the surface is composed of a strata of rock on hilly terrain, which, when plowed, leaves the tilled soil exposed to be washed away by the rains, which takes what fertility is in the land to the river. They can not raise sufficient crops on this land to support their families and are forced to seek employment in distant towns and localities. The land is devoid of forest, save a low brush near the river, and a few patches of small oaks. It is void of timber for either wood or lumber. Many of the people suffer during the winter because their homes are inadequate and because their fires must be kindled with green wood.

"The history of these people is most remarkable. They have always favored the white race. They have fought against the Cherokees, and even among themselves, for the white man. They have suffered many hardships and have even given up their possessions to the white man. There are at this time 38 families on the reservation—41 men, 38 women, and 93 children—172 people all told. There are only a dozen houses fit to live in. There is a schoolhouse on the reservation, which is supported by the State in the amount of \$1,500 annually. In this school there are two teachers. There are 43 pupils enrolled, with an average attendance of 34. These Indians have accepted the Latter Day Saints (Mormon) religion. A temple on the reservation was built by the Mormon Church. All services are well attended."

#### INDIANS MAKE APPEAL

The committee went out to the reservation, where a hearing was held at the schoolhouse for the Indians and a few white friends who spoke in their behalf. Afterwards they visited the homes of some of the tribesmen, where they saw for themselves where real poverty and distress exists. They found, for instance, three families of eight people living in a 1-room shack, with uncalled walls and roof, and with the sky visible through cracks in the walls and roof. These eight people were obliged to sleep on two beds and a nondescript frame structure which takes the place of a bed. They have no garden, no poultry, no hogs, no cattle, no fruit trees. There was nothing but abject squalor and poverty.

In another house of two rooms was found a family of eight living under similar environment. At this second home the family were at supper when the committee arrived. There was one loaf of corn bread on the table. The meal had been mixed with no other seasoning than salt and water. There was no meat, no eggs, no vegetables, no butter, no sirup, no fruit. The committee was told that the family had no money with which to buy these things. It is not hard to surmise what the other meals partaken of by this family are like.

#### IN DIREST POVERTY

However, all of the families are not quite so abjectly poor. There are several 4-room houses on the reservation, some of them with fairly good furnishings. In one was found a cook stove, with the family in possession of some poultry. There were a few fruit trees and a dozen bee gums. These are the only bees on the reservation. Water is secured from a spring under the hill. There are only one or two wells on the whole place.

With the exception of the river bottoms there is not an acre of level land on the reservation. The terrain is rolling, hilly, and rocky and is exceedingly poor and unproductive. It is doubtful if any other tract of land of equal size can be located in York County more undesirable for farming purposes. The nature of the soil is such that a high state of cultivation is impossible without an enormous expenditure of money and effort. Even then the results would be meager and inadequate, for the rains would soon wash the loosened soil into the gullies and river, leaving a bare strata of rock underneath.

#### LITTLE LIVESTOCK

White men without capital would starve on this place. On the reservation now there are four mules and horses and eight cows. These are personal property, however, not owned in common by all the Indians. There are no hogs, and only a few chickens here and there. The river bottoms, comprising about 75 acres, are level. This was once good land, but high waters of 1916 overflowed these lowlands, washing great holes in places and piling up white sand banks at random. Since that time only a part of the bottoms has been under cultivation. The elevation above the bed of the river is so slight that the stream frequently overflows, destroying the crops. For three years in succession the crops have thus been completely ruined.

#### MAKERS OF POTTERY

Some of the women make pottery which is attractive in form and design. Several of these show Indian heads neatly executed and true to life. There are vases and pots, loving cups with two handles; peace

pipes as large as small bowls, which they resemble; Indian-head pipes and just plain pipes; book ends, boats, bowls, candlesticks, toy washpots, tomahawks, and hatchets. The only implements used in fashioning these are the hands, a basin of water, and the shell of a gourd for scraping and polishing. The burning is done in an open fireplace for three or four days after molding. The process of burning lasts for three or four hours.

The pottery is marketed in Rock Hill, Fort Mill, Charlotte, and other near-by towns. Visits are exchanged between the Catawbas and the Cherokees of western North Carolina, and the Cherokees buy their pottery from the Catawbas. The Cherokees do not make pottery, as they have no suitable clay on their reservation. The two tribes intermarry to a very limited extent. Pottery can not be made without workable clay, which must be soft, flexible, elastic, and free of grit. The Catawbas get their clay from the Waxhaw swamps across the river, where a battle was fought in the Revolutionary War between the Patriots, led by Colonel Buford, and the Tories, under the notorious General Tarleton.

One of the regulations of long standing at Winthrop College, South Carolina's great school for women at Rock Hill, prohibits the sale of merchandise to or among the students. Under the requirement the girls are not permitted to sell cakes, candies, fancy articles, or anything else on the campus, either for personal profit or in the interest of special or charitable purposes. Yet there is one exception to this rule—and only one. It was made by the late President David Bancroft Johnson, founder of Winthrop, many years ago, and it permits the Catawba Indians to dispose of their pottery to the students at a designated place on the campus. Thus one may see Indian women displaying their wares just inside one of the gates, and always at the same place. Doctor Johnson realized how hard it is for these people to earn a livelihood. Permission to sell pottery on the campus was his way of expressing sympathy for them.

#### EDUCATING THE YOUNG

The school is perhaps the most worth-while thing on the reservation. There are at present two teachers, with an enrollment of 42 pupils. The principal is J. C. Davis, a native South Carolinian. He is a graduate of the College of Charleston. He has had an experience as a teacher of 18 years in the public schools of South Carolina. His school is orderly and well managed. He reports that Indian children learn as readily as children of the white race and are as responsive to rules and regulations. They are intelligent, industrious, alert to learn, and are making creditable progress. Mr. Davis is assisted by Miss Elsie Blue, daughter of Samuel Blue, one of the chiefs.

There is no such thing as a real chief among the Catawbas. The royal line became extinct many years ago. The word "chief" is now used only in a complimentary sense. Every two years three men are elected as a kind of executive committee to administer the unwritten tribal laws of the reservation. At this election both men and women vote. In rare cases, when the executive head can not reach a decision satisfactory to all, the case is referred to the agent for adjudication. Mr. Flowers is regarded as the "big brother" of the Indians. No case has ever been appealed over his decision. At present the executive committee consists of Samuel Blue, chairman; Robert Sanders; and Idle Sanders.

#### COMMUNITY PROPERTY

The Catawbas are citizens of the United States, but not of South Carolina. The reservation is the property of the Indians as a whole, which means that they do not hold title to individual tracts of land. They can not sell the land on which they live, although title to it rests in their name. But they can leave it and move elsewhere or out of the State if they so desire. When the tribe was more numerous and owned their undivided 144,000 acres on both sides of the river, they leased certain portions of their lands to the whites under 99-year contracts for nominal rentals. Once leased, however, the Indians never recovered their holdings. It is said that the land on which Rock Hill, Fort Mill, and other towns are located was lost to the Catawbas in this way.

In 1840 a treaty was entered into between the Legislature of South Carolina and the Catawba Indians whereby they transferred all of their lands to the State for the consideration "of a tract of land of the valuation of \$5,000, 300 acres of which is to be good, arable land, fit for cultivation, to be purchased in Haywood County, N. C., or, in some other mountainous or thinly populated region where the said Indians may desire." Some historians state that this land was never purchased and that the Indians did not leave South Carolina, but Agent Flowers says that they migrated to North Carolina, and remained in Haywood County two years, after which they became dissatisfied and returned to South Carolina, the legislature having deeded back to them "652 acres of the lands they had surrendered, together with an annual pension of \$800."

#### APPROPRIATION SMALL

Since 1840 the legislature has made a small annual appropriation to the Catawbas, but, considering the fact that they surrendered to the State a vast domain of valuable land for the small sum of \$5,000, it would appear that the State has never shown them the consideration they deserve. The lands they abandoned for \$800 a year are

now worth millions of dollars. The amount of the appropriation has, however, been increased from time to time, but the amount of \$8,950 allotted to them for 1930 is wholly inadequate to provide for the actual needs of the 172 members of the tribe.

Before this money reaches the individuals the following deductions must be made: Salary for the agent, \$450; salary for a physician, \$500; funeral expenses, \$150; care of helpless old people, \$500; salaries for the two school-teachers, \$1,500; making a total deduction of \$4,100. This leaves only \$4,850 for distribution among the Indians. It is apparent, therefore, that an individual man, woman, or child gets but \$28 for his or her support for an entire year, in circumstances insufficient to provide a livelihood on account of the nature of the soil on which they live.

#### EVENTUAL STARVATION

A visit to the reservation will convince the most skeptical that the sum of \$28 a year per capita means eventual starvation for these people unless an additional income can be provided by the Indians themselves. In desperation many of the Indians have left their poverty-stricken homes and sought employment in near-by towns. Several families live in Rock Hill, where men and women are employed in the cotton mills. It appears that their work is satisfactory. But the majority of them have always refused to leave their ancestral homes.

Nor should it be forgotten that the Catawba Indians have always been friendly and loyal to the whites. From colonial days down to recent times they have taken part in all wars waged by the whites. They fought against other tribes of Indians, particularly the Cherokees, in defense of the early settlements in South Carolina. Sixteen hundred of them were in the Revolutionary War on the side of the patriots. They marched with our troops in the Mexican War and in the Spanish-American War, and five volunteered for service in the World War, one of whom went overseas. The names of these five were: Ernest Sanders, Joseph Sanders, Early Brown, Richard Harris, and Robert Harris.

#### DEBT OF GRATITUDE

For sentimental reasons the State owes a debt of gratitude to the Indians for the beautiful names given to rivers and towns scattered all over the State. Among these may be mentioned Catawba, Waxhaw, Wateree, Santee, Saluda, Congaree, Edisto, Enoree, Pee Dee, Salkahatchee, Asheppo, Elloree, Cherokee, Chicora, Combahee, Coosaw, Seneca, Yammassee, Pocotaligo, Eutaw, and others. Such wonderfully musical names are a priceless heritage to any State or community. There stands at Fort Mill one of the few monuments erected in honor of the American Indians. There is recorded thereon the names and deeds of those who followed the fortunes of the Southern Confederacy in the War between the States.

Also one of the first, if not the first, temperance petitions originated with the Catawba Indians. It was presented to Chief Justice Henley, of the Supreme Court, by Haigler, one of the great chiefs, on May 26, 1756. Haigler said: "I desire a stop put to the selling of strong liquors by the white people to my people, especially near the Indian towns. If the white people make strong drink, let them sell it to one another or drink it in their own families. This will avoid a great deal of mischief which otherwise will happen from my people getting drunk and quarrelling with the white people." In the present day this prohibition appeal from an Indian out of the distant past brings a wholesome message for our guidance in discussing one of the most perplexing problems that has ever confronted our people.

#### FUTILE PETITIONS

Petitions have been presented to the legislatures of South Carolina on behalf of the Catawba Indians for the last hundred years. While the State has not turned a deaf ear to them, adequate provision has not been made to prevent want and destitution among them. Perhaps none of these was more pathetic or appealing than the one presented by Peter Harris soon after the Revolutionary War. It will bear repetition here because it is as essentially true to-day as it was when delivered before the legislature:

"I am one of the lingering survivors of an almost extinguished race. Our graves will soon be our habitations. I am one of the few stalks that still remain in the field after the tempest of the Revolution is passed. I fought the British for your sake. The British have disappeared, nor have I gained by their defeat. I pursued the deer for subsistence; the deer are disappearing, and I must starve. God ordained me for the forest, and my ambition is for the shade. But the strength of my arm decays, and my feet fail me in the chase. The hand which fought the British for your liberties is now open for your relief. In my youth I bled in battle that you might be independent. Let not my heart in my old age bleed for the want of your commiseration."

#### COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The most comprehensive plan for disposing of this matter and properly providing for the Indians for all time was contained in the provisions of a bill introduced in the legislature by Senator Hart of York County in 1924. The beneficiaries of this measure were divided into two classes, farmers and residents of cities. Each head of a family who elected to farm was to receive \$2,000 for the purchase of a farm, and

also the following sums for agricultural implements and supplies: First year, \$400; second year, \$200; third year, \$200. Those who wished to live in a town or city were to receive \$2,000 for each family for purchasing a home, and also \$200 for the first year and \$100 for the second and third years. As the State was not financially able to invest so large a sum (about \$100,000) in the Catawbas at that time, the bill was allowed to die.

In an effort to aid Senator BLEASE and the Committee on Indian Affairs, in reaching a determination in connection with the Catawba matter, the chamber of commerce at Rock Hill has addressed a communication to a large number of civic and religious organizations throughout the State asking them to write or telegraph the former in support of the movement to secure favorable action by Congress on behalf of these neglected people who have consistently stood by and fought for this Nation in weal and in woe.

#### CONCRETE SUGGESTION

Senators FRAZIER and THOMAS have returned to Washington with a very determined notion that something should be done for the Catawbas. Senator THOMAS has made the concrete suggestion that the Government should recognize them. After this is done, he says, the next thing should be to put roofs over their heads, so that they will be protected from the weather. After that he thinks a small factory or factories should be located on the Indian lands by the Government and the remaining men and women instructed how to make pottery under improved conditions. That, he says, would give them something worth while to employ their time and allow them to make small amounts of money and gradually raise them out of the slovenly habits of living into which they have been permitted to fall.

While Senator THOMAS has not in any way criticized the State of South Carolina for the present plight of the Indians, it is not hard to see that he believes that they could be far above the conditions in which they now exist had proper supervision and more State funds been used to educate them and train them to become more beneficial to themselves. Some form of vocational training whereby the Indians can be made to earn a part of their living expenses is the uppermost idea in the minds of Senators THOMAS and FRAZIER at this time.

This suggestion of Senator THOMAS has been presented to a group of 12 or 15 prominent Catawbas. At the same time they were asked how they would like to farm on good lands, with comfortable homes, a garden, work animals, cows, poultry, orchards, with direction for a few years of an agricultural expert. An individual poll was taken to get an expression of opinion on the two ideas. The vote was unanimous for the farm as against the city and the factory. Every instinct of the Indian is for a life in the open. Happiness for him can not be found in the crowded environment of industrial institutions, nor in man-made towns and cities.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 4104) authorizing an appropriation for expenses of delegates to attend the International Conference on Load Lines at London, England, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 440) thereon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 917) for the relief of Margaret Diederich, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 441) thereon.

Mr. STEPHENS, from the Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the bill (S. 3691) to amend an act entitled "An act relative to naturalization and citizenship of married women," approved September 22, 1922, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 442) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1971) for the relief of Buford E. Ellis, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 445) thereon.

#### CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMAL LIFE

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 246) to appoint a special committee to investigate matters pertaining to the replacement and conservation of wild animal life, reported it without amendment, and it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. DENEEN, subsequently, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which the foregoing resolution was referred, reported it without amendment.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on to-day, April 16, 1930, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3715) authorizing the State Highway Board of Georgia, in cooperation with the State Highway Department of South Carolina,



the city of Augusta, and Richmond County, Ga., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near Fifth Street, Augusta, Ga.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS

As in open executive session,

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably Executive E, Seventy-first Congress, second session, a convention and protocol with Great Britain defining the rights of the United States and its nationals in Iraq, which was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported sundry post-office nominations, which were placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. BLEASE. I introduce a bill, by request, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce, together with a copy of the minutes of the Board of Commissioners of Georgetown County, S. C., and the report of the committee of the General Assembly of South Carolina along with the bill as passed by it.

By Mr. BLEASE (by request):

A bill (S. 4182) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Georgetown, S. C., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Black-Pee Dee River and Waccamaw River at or near Georgetown, S. C. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 4184) granting a pension to Carrie J. Mealey; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4185) granting compensation to William J. Johnson; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 4186) for the relief of Brig. Gen. Harry Rethers, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4187) authorizing the enrollment of certain Indians residing in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 4188) to provide for the establishment and development of American air transport services overseas, to encourage construction in the United States by American capital of American airships and other aircraft for use in foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4189) granting a pension to Carrie C. Crain (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4190) granting a pension to Emma Langley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN:

A bill (S. 4191) granting a pension to Elizabeth Butler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4192) granting a pension to William Fay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 4193) for the relief of the State of Florida for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1928 and 1929; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4194) for the relief of Fred P. Steiger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### MIGRATION OF FILIPINOS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I wish to introduce a bill, to the purpose of which I invite the attention of Senators. It is a bill to regulate the migration of citizens of the Philippine Islands to the continental United States, and for other purposes. For the benefit of Senators present, and in the hope that it will be given early consideration by the Senate, I ask that, by unanimous consent, the clerk may read the bill. It is brief.

The bill (S. 4183) to regulate the migration of citizens of the Philippine Islands to the continental United States, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That from and after July 1, 1930, migration of citizens of the Philippine Islands to continental United States shall be limited to students, visitors for business or pleasure, merchants, government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees.

For the issuance of permits to travel to continental United States an official shall be designated as provided in paragraph (f) of section 28 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended.

This act shall be in force and effect for five years from and after the date of its approval, and if within that time the independence of the Philippines shall have been granted or by act of Congress definitely provided for, then this act shall continue in force indefinitely thereafter.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Just a word. The bill has now been referred to the appropriate committee. I respectfully ask that the committee give early consideration to the bill, inasmuch as it deals with one phase of the large question which is now immediately before the Senate. I understand the House committee will take into consideration this or a like bill, as it is now considering another bill dealing with the immigration problem. On another occasion I shall ask the Senate to indulge me while I seek to justify the passage of this bill.

While on my feet, by the further indulgence of the Senator from Arizona, busy as I am as one of the conferees on the tariff bill I have been unable to attend regularly the sessions of the Senate, and to be benefited by the arguments which are in progress, but I take this occasion to say that I hope the pending bill, which is the unfinished business, will sooner or later—and the sooner the better, in my judgment—be so amended as to limit its scope to Mexico rather than to include, as it now does, as I understand, all the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I see no danger coming from Ecuador or Brazil or Argentina or Colombia or Peru; I see no immigration problem there and here to be considered; but I do see a very grave problem in respect of Mexican immigration. I therefore hope that the Harris bill, now pending, will be so amended as to be limited to the Mexican problem, to use that phrase.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I not only approve of the bill which the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] has introduced but I hope that he will offer it as an amendment to the pending bill. Next to the influx of Mexican labor, the most objectionable thing with which we have to deal in this country is the influx of Filipino labor. The bill introduced by the Senator from California seems to offer a method whereby the influx of Filipino labor may be limited, where a quota might be objected to, and I hope the Senator from California will eventually offer it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If, in a parliamentary sense, it shall appear wise, in order to achieve the purpose of the bill I have just introduced I shall offer it as an amendment to the pending Harris bill, I shall certainly do so. I am hoping, however, that, in any event, the committee to which the bill I have introduced has been referred will give it very early and favorable consideration.

#### RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. SHORTRIDGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 51) to subject certain immigrants, born in countries of the Western Hemisphere, to the quota under the immigration laws, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### INVESTIGATION OF AFFAIRS OF INDIANS OF CATTARAUGUS, ALLEGANY, AND OIL SPRINGS RESERVATIONS, N. Y.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, from the subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 248) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Comptroller General is hereby directed (1) to make a full and complete investigation and audit of all transactions, books of accounts, business and affairs, receipts and disbursements of all moneys arising from the leasing of oil, gas, and other lands and property belonging to Indians within the Cattaraugus, Allegany, and Oil Springs Reservations in the State of New York for the period from February 19, 1875, to the date of passage of this resolution, and (2) to report thereon to the Senate as soon as practicable.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—SECOND MORNING HOUR

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following notice of an amendment of the rules, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

In accordance with Rule XL, Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice that it is my intention to offer an amendment to paragraph 3, Rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate inserting between the word "Mondays" and the word "the" in said paragraph the words "and Thursdays."

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide a second morning hour in each week during which the calling of the calendar can not be dispensed with except by unanimous consent.

## UNITED STATES-CANADIAN-ALASKAN HIGHWAY

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, some weeks ago I introduced the bill (S. 1811) providing for a study regarding the construction of a highway to connect the northwestern part of the United States with British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and Alaska in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada. The bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported back favorably and it passed the Senate. The House has passed a similar bill. The House bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Heretofore the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry passed upon a similar bill.

This presents a very difficult parliamentary situation. I am unable to go into conference, unable to accept the House bill, and I think in the interest of expedition in the matter of legislation the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that that may be done and that the bill passed by the House (H. R. 8368) bearing the same title may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I did not understand the last statement of the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I merely requested that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that ought to be done, but I would like to inquire of the Senator, when the bill which we passed got to the House of Representatives, what was done with it there? To what committee did the Speaker refer it?

Mr. McNARY. The Senate bill has just reached the House. The Senate passed the bill and the House passed a similar bill. The Senate bill went to the House. When the House bill came to the Senate it was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. That creates the situation which I have just described.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand. It leads to a blind legislative alley. But I am wondering, Mr. President, why the Senator from Oregon, instead of requesting that the House bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, does not follow the precedent of the House and have it lie on the Vice President's table for 10 months before it is referred to a committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, as I understand it, the bill which passed the House is identical with the Senate bill except that it provides for \$10,000 instead of \$25,000, as the Senate bill provided. I would suggest to the Senator from Oregon under those circumstances that the Senator ask for the passage of the House bill.

Mr. McNARY. I am merely asking for the reference of the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which had jurisdiction over the bill which passed the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CHILDREN'S TUBERCULOSIS SANATORIUM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3425) to amend the act of Congress approved March 1, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a children's tuberculosis sanatorium," which was, on page 1, after line 10, to insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

That if the land proposed to be acquired as a site for the said sanatorium is without the District of Columbia the title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a satisfactory price can not be agreed upon for the purchase of said land, the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected for said site either in the State of Maryland or in the State of Virginia in accordance with the laws of said States, and expenses of procuring evidence of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation herein made for the purchase of said site.

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXCHANGE OF LAND IN KLINGLE FORD VALLEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3440) authorizing the exchange of 663 square feet of property acquired for the park system for 2,436 square feet of neighboring prop-

erty, all in the Klingle Ford Valley, for addition to the park system of the National Capital, which was, on page 3, line 6, to strike out "Columbia. The" and insert "Columbia, the."

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to inquire as to whether this bill has anything to do with the Great Falls?

Mr. CAPPER. Not at all. It is merely an exchange of property in Klingle Ford Valley for an addition to the park system of the National Capital.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me ask the Senator from Kansas whether the Great Falls bill has as yet been reported from the committee?

Mr. CAPPER. It has not.

Mr. NORRIS. Has it been ordered to be reported?

Mr. CAPPER. It was ordered to be reported, but the report is not yet ready to submit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas to agree to the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	George	Kendrick	Smoot
Ashurst	Gillett	Keyes	Steck
Barkley	Glass	La Follette	Stelwer
Bingham	Glenn	McKellar	Stephens
Black	Goff	McNary	Sullivan
Blaine	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Swanson
Bleas	Gould	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Greene	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brook	Grundy	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Overman	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Patterson	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Heflin	Robison, Ky.	Watson
Deneen	Howell	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Johnson	Shipstead	
Fess	Jones	Shortridge	
Frazier	Kean	Simmons	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is detained on account of the death of his brother. I ask that this announcement may stand for the remainder of the week.

Mr. FESS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCULLOCH] is unavoidably detained from the Chamber. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] is unavoidably absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are all detained from the Senate by illness.

I further desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] are in London attending the naval conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

## ADDITION TO WESTERN NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. ASHURST. I report from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments the bill (S. 3585) to eliminate certain lands from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., as an addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, and I submit a report (No. 443) thereon. The bill was introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, and is reported with an amendment proposed by my colleague, Senator HAYDEN.

The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the State land commissioner, and the board of supervisors of the county in which the lands are located are in favor of the passage of the bill. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof to insert the following:



That the following-described land be, and the same is hereby, eliminated from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., and added to and made a part of the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, subject to all valid rights and claims of individuals initiated prior to the approval of this act: All that part of the Tusayan National Forest lying east of the Colorado River and north of the Little Colorado River, unsurveyed, but which will probably be when surveyed in townships 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36 north, ranges 5 and 6 east; all lands in township 31 north, range 6 east, which are now a part of the Tusayan National Forest; sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 to 14, inclusive, east half section 23, sections 24 and 25, east half section 26 and sections 35 and 36, township 30 north, range 6 east; sections 27 to 34, inclusive, township 30 north, range 7 east; sections 1, 2, and 11 to 14, inclusive, sections 23 to 26, inclusive; sections 35 and 36, township 29 north, range 6 east; sections 3 to 10, inclusive, and sections 15 to 36, inclusive, township 29 north, range 7 east; section 1 and north half section 12, township 28 north, range 6 east; sections 1 to 23, inclusive, and sections 29 to 32, inclusive, township 28 north, range 7 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona: *Provided*, That all unappropriated and unreserved public lands in sections 24 to 28, inclusive, and sections 33 to 36, inclusive, in township 28 north, range 7 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona, be, and the same are hereby, added to and made a part of the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, subject to all valid rights and claims of individuals initiated prior to approval of this act.

SEC. 2. That upon conveyance to the United States of a good and sufficient title to any privately owned land within the areas described in this act, the owners or their assigns thereof are hereby authorized under regulations of the Secretary of the Interior, to select at any time within 15 years after the approval of this act, from the surveyed, unappropriated, unreserved, nonmineral public lands of the United States, in the State of Arizona, lands approximately equal in value to the lands thus conveyed, such values to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue patents for the lands thus selected: *Provided*, That the lands conveyed to the United States under authority of this act shall thereupon become a part of the Western Navajo Indian Reservation.

SEC. 3. That before any exchange of lands as above provided is effected notice of such exchange describing the lands involved therein shall be published once each week for four consecutive weeks in some newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties within which the selected lands are situated.

SEC. 4. That the State of Arizona shall have the right to select other public lands in lieu of sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 within said addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, in the same manner as is provided in the enabling act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 557).

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

Mr. GOULD. Mr. President, on Monday last during my unavoidable absence and in the absence of other Senators who had an interest in it the bill (S. 202) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes, was passed by the Senate, as I understand, without any discussion. I should like to have the vote whereby the bill was passed reconsidered and have the bill restored to the calendar, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Maine desires to move a reconsideration of the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GOULD. That is what I desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And to request the House to return the bill.

Mr. GOULD. The bill is still here on the table, as I understand. It was held up on Tuesday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine to reconsider the votes by which the bill referred to by him was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, is that the King bill?

Mr. GOULD. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the bill provides for the deportation of certain aliens found in the United States in violation of law. It is a very meritorious measure, and I do not see why the Senate should reconsider its action in passing the bill because of one or two Members who happened to oppose it were not in the Chamber. I think we ought to have some very good reason given as to why a reconsideration should be had. I think that the bill ought to become a law.

Mr. GOULD. There are a number of Senators who do not have that feeling about it, and they would like to discuss the bill in any event. They have not had an opportunity to do that.

It was passed by the Senate during their absence, and it was not discussed at all, and they would like to be heard on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine may enter a motion to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as the Chair understands the time limit for entering such motion has not as yet expired.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] entered a motion yesterday to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk informs the Chair that the Senator from Connecticut gave notice that he would enter such a motion.

Mr. JOHNSON. I beg pardon.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have no objection to the Senator entering the motion, but I do not think we ought to stop to consider it now when we have a very important bill now pending before the Senate.

Mr. GOULD. Then, Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the votes by which Senate bill 202 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered.

#### GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate passed the bill (S. 3960) to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stat. 616). The House has passed an identical bill, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. I move to reconsider the votes by which Senate bill 3960 was ordered to a third reading and passed, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NYE. I move that the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6343) to provide for the extension of the boundary limits of the proposed Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the establishment of which is authorized by the act approved May 22, 1926 (44 Stat. p. 616), and that the bill be put upon its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee is discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it is before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the boundary limits of the tract of land in the Great Smoky Mountains in the States of North Carolina and Tennessee, recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in his report of April 14, 1926, for the establishment of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, be, and the same are hereby, extended to include lands adjacent to the east boundary as defined in said report to a line approximately as follows:

From a point on top of the Balsam Mountains at the boundary of Swain and Haywood Counties just north of Black Camp Gap; thence following east the top of the mountain range to Jonathan Knob and Hemphill Bald; thence along top of ridge through Camp Gap to Bent Knee Knob; thence following the main ridge to Cataloochee Creek to a point on the boundary of the area described in report of the Secretary of the Interior of April 14, 1926; and the lands within said boundary extension, or any part thereof, may be accepted on behalf of the United States in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 22, 1926, for inclusion in the area to be known as the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RADIO MERGER

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, the New York American this morning prints a news item regarding the action of the Radio Corporation of America in issuing 6,500,000 shares of its stock, of the value of \$543,000,000, to the General Electric and the Westinghouse Cos. in payment for patents for electrical and radio apparatus. As a result of this, these two companies will have control of the Radio Corporation of America, which in turn has built up a tremendous line of subsidiary companies to control the manufacturing and distribution of radio sets and also of the amusement business.

This article is headed "Full Control of Radio for Two Companies," and reads in part as follows:

The General Electric Corporation and the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. will get complete control of the Radio Corporation

of America, with its several affiliates in the broadcasting, amusement, and radio-manufacturing fields through deal to be announced to-morrow.

The article is of such import to the radio world that I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL CONTROL OF RADIO FOR TWO COMPANIES—GENERAL ELECTRIC AND THE WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC GET 6,500,000 MORE SHARES

By James P. Maher

The General Electric Corporation and the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. will get complete control of the Radio Corporation of America, with its several affiliates in the broadcasting, amusement, and radio-manufacturing fields through deal to be announced to-morrow.

The Radio Corporation will give 6,500,000 shares of its common stock, valued at \$543,400,000, in return for patents and preferred stock owned by General Electric and Westinghouse. General Electric will get 60 per cent and Westinghouse 40 per cent.

This will leave the Radio Corporation with 13,000,000 common shares outstanding, of which General Electric will own over 40 per cent. Together with the Westinghouse Corporation, General Electric will hold 8,000,000 shares, or over 68 per cent of the voting stock.

APPROVED BY DIRECTORS

The deal was approved by the directors of the Radio Corporation at their last meeting, according to statement made at the corporation's offices yesterday.

It was rumored that the corporation planned to retire its preferred stock in connection with the deal, but this was denied by those familiar with its affairs. Preferred retirement may come later it was hinted. There is no financing planned in connection with the arrangement, it was said.

Acquisition of the radio and other patents of General Electric and Westinghouse now in use by Radio Corporation will place the corporation in better position to take care of expanding business and increasing demands for communications service, the directors believe.

There is expectation in financial circles that the General Electric and Westinghouse companies may make special distribution to stockholders on completion of the deal with the Radio Corporation.

General Electric is expected to hold all of the Radio stock it will receive, however. Through such holdings it dominates the affairs of the corporation and thereby is placed in almost as strong position in the communications, radio manufacturing, amusement, and associated fields as it occupies in the electrical manufacturing, utility, and power industries.

One report indicates that the General Electric management plans formation of a holding company, in which it will put its Radio Corporation stock, similar to the Electric Bond & Share Co., through which it manages its vast utility and power organizations throughout the world.

IMPORTANT FACTOR

Through dominating the Radio Corporation affairs the General Electric Corporation will be one of the most important factors in the communications industry—the radio manufacturing business—broadcasting, and also in the amusement field.

Radio Corporation, after getting control of the Victor Talking Machine Co. in 1929, formed the Radio Corporation of America-Victor Corporation, which manufactures and sells all sorts of radio and talking machines, records, etc. This corporation is owned 50 per cent by Radio Corporation, 30 per cent by General Electric, and 20 per cent by Westinghouse.

The General Motors Radio Corporation was then formed, owned 51 per cent by General Motors and 49 per cent by Radio. Through a country-wide chain of agents, separated in 30 zones, the General Motors Radio plans to lead in retailing of all radio products similar to the chain of automobile distributing agencies of the General Motors Corporation.

Radio Corporation controls the Radio-Keith-Orpheum Corporation, which now is offering \$10,000,000 new stock to shareholders to pay for acquisition of its growing chain of theaters throughout the country, displaying its own pictures as well as others. Radio also owns 50 per cent of the capital stock of the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that if the Department of Justice had gone ahead in the prosecution of the Radio Trust this new trust probably would not be formed. I hope the Department of Justice will take note of this enormous organization which is being formed to dominate the entire manufacture and distribution business in the radio world.

I ask also to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the New York Times under date of April 16, entitled "Radio-Keith Plans Offering of Stock," in view of the purchase of amusement companies, of which it is seeking control.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO-KEITH PLANS OFFERING OF STOCK—390,000 SHARES OF CLASS A TO GO TO STOCKHOLDERS AT \$35 ON BASIS OF 1 FOR 6—TO PAY FOR ACQUISITIONS—NEW THEATERS ADDED RECENTLY ADD 50,000 SEATING CAPACITY TO PRESENT 2,000,000

The Radio-Keith-Orpheum Corporation is planning to offer about 390,000 shares of class A stock to stockholders at \$35 a share on the basis of one new share for each six shares held. At yesterday's closing price of 42, the rights will be worth about \$1 each.

The new issue has been underwritten by Lehman Bros. and the Ben-camera Blair Corporation. The proceeds are to finance acquisitions and to provide for new productions.

Hiram S. Brown, president, announced yesterday the addition of numerous theaters for the circuit owned by the company, extending from coast to coast. RKO acquired complete control of the Lisbon-Heldingsfeld chain of houses, which include the E. F. Albee Theater in Cincinnati and the B. F. Keith-Albee Palace in Columbus, in which the Messrs. Lisbon and Heldingsfeld and associates formerly held a minority interest, and full ownership in the five other theaters in Cincinnati, the Capitol, Palace, Strand, Lyric, and Family. The B. F. Keith, Colonial, and the State theaters in Dayton, the Majestic in Columbus, and the Empress and Regent in Grand Rapids, were also acquired in the deal.

In addition, RKO has purchased the Oriental Theater in Detroit, the Rivoli and Palace in Toledo, the Lincoln in Trenton, N. J., and the State and Capitol in Union City, N. J. Workmen are now dismantling the old Columbia Theater in New York City, which is to be replaced by a large RKO theater for first-run radio pictures, for occupancy about November 1, 1930.

The new theaters acquired will give the Radio-Keith-Orpheum Corporation almost 50,000 additional seating capacity on a circuit that already entertains 2,000,000 patrons daily.

WORLD PEACE AND ECONOMIC WELFARE—ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR SACKETT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the new American ambassador to Germany, Hon. Frederic M. Sackett, delivered a particularly timely and effectual address before the American Chamber of Commerce in Berlin on March 15, 1930. We, of the Senate, have a particularly intimate interest in Ambassador Sackett because of his recent service here among us as one of our highly cherished and universally respected colleagues. But his Berlin address takes on an independent importance of its own through the philosophy of common sense, which it cogently presents. He correctly finds that the economic welfare of America is related to the economic welfare of the world; and he correctly puts our economic impulses alongside of our spiritual aspirations on the side of world peace. I am certain that these views will be largely entertained in the United States. The sanctions needed to implement the Kellogg peace pact are not the political contracts of world powers but the inherent common sense of the world's people. This common sense is primarily spiritual. But it also is economic and emphatically practical. I think Ambassador Sackett's observations bespeak the typical, progressive, enlightened American attitude, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his admirable Berlin address may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The address is as follows:

In giving a response to this very delightful welcome extended to the American ambassador by the chamber of commerce in Berlin my first sensation is that I am among friends. And among friends one always feels the warmth and radiance of hospitality. The long line of illustrious men who have preceded me in office naturally emphasizes the high standard that must be met in fitting into the niche that has been carved by American representatives to Germany.

I hear on every hand of the affectionate regard in which my predecessor Doctor Schurman was held in Germany, the friendship which he gained, and the keen regrets that were voiced when he felt that the time had come for his retirement from the cares of office. To follow a man like him and men like Houghton, Gerard, Leishman, Tower and Hill, to speak only of the more recent members of our diplomatic representation, gives a will of accomplishment that will test the stamina of any man.

In the midst of the kindly greetings I have received during the few days that I have been among you, I can not escape the feeling that I could speak with more modest assurance, if I were looking back upon a long residence in Germany recounting accomplishments already won instead of trying to speak to you at the very beginning of my service here. And yet, when I enter such an atmosphere of commercial life feeling secure in your friendly attitude, I confess to an intuition of close relationship with you both in thought and experience. I have known well the organized chambers of commerce that encourage our business life in America. I have served such a chamber as its president, just in the capacity as my friend upon my left is serving you. The scene presented to-night with this keen-minded, clear think-



ing audience, might easily be the duplicate of those same banquet tables over which I have so often presided at home. In meeting you, therefore, even for the first time I own to a feeling far removed from strangeness, for in all commercial groups we have the same interests, whether we are in Berlin or London, New York or San Francisco. We speak the same language of the world's economic life.

So to-night in these congenial surroundings and in this atmosphere of commerce, perhaps it will be interesting and, I trust, not out of place to speak of the rapidly changing American conditions and of their effect upon the Nation's relation to world affairs.

American business development reads like a romance. It tells a story of how commercial life swept onward from small beginnings over the obstacles of poverty and estrangement from the world at large. America was driving toward the goal of providing the necessities of life for increasing numbers of people who came across the sea to enjoy her freedom and her opportunities. Because of the fast-growing population, the home markets of America expanded more rapidly than her capital resources available at home could satisfy. For many years she found herself barely able to keep her physical plant equipment abreast of her requirements. The money resources were wholly inadequate to carry on the business which the home markets offered. We had the plant but we did not have any working capital.

Our business pioneers were little daunted by the capital requirements which must be met, nor were they fearful of going into debt to the world at large to meet this prime necessity of their development. Therefore for many years America's greatest financial problem was the establishment of sound and convincing credits in the financial centers of the world, whereby there could be borrowed at proper interest rates the necessary funds that would permit the rapid development of her commercial life. Thus we planned to overtake the needs of home demand.

Behind America's willingness to use credit to the utmost was the courage and determination of her leaders in commercial life. There was a feeling of confidence in the ultimate values that lay behind the brawn and brain of the people and in the wealth of natural resources which was calling to the spirit of a pioneer race for development. They saw the expanding markets, they felt the urge for accomplishment, and they took their courage in their two hands and pledged their all to secure the means to satisfy their needs. We had many years of struggle as a debtor Nation. It was hard to see the profits of our industry go to pay the interest upon the borrowed gold. It seemed like the payment of a tribute to the world. It required courage and a sublime faith in the ultimate result.

The psychology of the situation played an important part. The problem, as American business met it, was so to fortify its credit ratings that the borrowings could be made at minimum of cost of three-fourths to secure such a ratio between the interest at which we borrowed and the profit derived from the business done that the accumulating margin would rapidly build a national surplus. The country's economic foresight capitalized the energy and optimism of its people. Through all America's history as a debtor Nation we ran in truth a race with peace. Many times was her credit shaken by untoward events, and it took statesmanship and courage to avert collapse. The financial world, however, gauged the prospects of our new land by the firm faith of our own commercial life displayed in the ultimate result. It watched a growing national income as it rose from year to year and rolled the margin between interest and profit, like a giant snowball, to build a financial surplus.

Yet it was a race with peace. When the creditor world of Europe was plunged into the cataclysm of the Great War—when creditor nations needed all their own resources and called on us for payment—there came the crucial test of America's readiness to meet the forced maturity of its borrowings. That sudden call was a rude financial awakening, yet it developed the amazing fact that the surplus assets of American economic life had so accumulated in the years of peaceful progress that her industries were prepared to meet the demands for settlement.

In an orderly manner, and without panic crisis, she brought back every obligation that was offered. She stepped almost in a day from the position of a debtor to the world at large. She cast aside the shackles of an interest burden that seemingly was draining her economic progress. It is doubtful whether there was realization anywhere, until the demand for payment actually came, that the great effort of American commerce to create a national wealth sufficient to liquidate her indebtedness to the world had been successfully achieved.

The period in which industry had accomplished this result was short, indeed. Commercial development in America could hardly be said to have begun until a transportation system had become a reality, or until the smoke of battle of the War between the States had drifted far behind.

In less than 50 years of actual industrial progress American business had paid the tribute of her borrowings. She had met the obligations of the most rapidly expanding market of any country of all time. The story of her economic expansion in pre-war times pays homage to the reserves that lay behind a forceful people, guided by courageous and resourceful leadership.

The consciousness which brought realization of the change in America's status from a debtor to a creditor Nation almost immediately discerned the scope of further problems in her economic progress. An analysis of conditions following the war gave warning that the increasing surplus had given impetus to rapid expansion in productive capacity. It was evident that the great consuming market of the Nation had been caught and conquered in the race of commerce. Further extensions on the scale of the recent past would surely render overproduction in all lines a serious menace to prosperity. Almost as suddenly as the change in the financial status was appreciated, the commercial values of world relationships became apparent.

We can clearly see the beginnings of this new era in American affairs during the recent years—how her commercial life has been discovering the interdependence of our national prosperity, with the prosperity of every other country. The overseas world trade which must care for any surplus over our national demands, is dependent on the buying power of other peoples. That buying power, in turn, is rigidly confined by the degree of prosperity of every nation concerned. For that reason there has come to American business and finance an appreciation that, apart from any heritage of altruistic feeling with which our people feel that they are endowed, their own prosperity is literally interwoven with the internal economic conditions of every nation.

In an industrial country like America with its ample proportions and mounting surplus the expanding productive capacity seriously demands that its foreign commerce be encouraged and safeguarded. There is no illusion prevalent at home that an export trade can permanently prosper unless through imports or by other method of transfer there shall be created an equivalent exchange of values with the world at large. In 1929 the export trade of America amounted to \$5,150,000,000. I cite these figures in no boastful sense but to give a clue to the economic reasons which influence America's foreign policies.

The value of that trade to her own prosperity becomes evident when it is realized that already she exports more than any other country. Without such export outlet that vast quantity of production would be thrown back upon the markets within our own borders and would quickly cripple our economic life. This valuable export trade is adequately protected in every commercial sense by constantly increasing imports. The volume of imports is so large that its loss to the countries of origin would seriously curtail, if not annihilate, the prosperity which such country enjoys as a result of our purchasing power. In 1929 America's imports amounted to \$4,400,000,000. The margin between these exports and imports is unquestionably compensated through the invisible exports of money resulting from the expenditures of hundreds of thousands of tourists and the net balance of international interest payments.

The importance of encouraging overseas exports is one of the foundations on which America has built her modern policy in the field of international relationships. The experience of the struggle with early poverty—the achievement of commercial interests in building a creditor nation out of a debtor state through 50 years of peace have taught their lessons. The realization of the disaster that might have overtaken our prosperity, had the financial shock of war arrived before the accumulation of capital became sufficient to meet the demand for payment—these reflections showed plainly the common sense that should dictate our future foreign policies.

Full employment is the best guarantee of prosperity, which in turn spells the happiness of a people. Full employment within producing countries is dependent upon the unabated continuance of commerce. We earnestly believe that in our country such continuance, and a normal expansion as well, is interwoven with international peace. The maintenance of peace for economic reasons gives substance to this diplomacy of common sense in world affairs. It places a very practical foundation under a foreign policy of seeking economic welfare in our dealings with the peoples of the world. Much has been said at home in commendation of diplomatic efforts which urge upon all governments the elimination of armed conflict and the building of an Utopia of peace on the ashes of a war-torn world. We have a vivid national hope of the substitution of the conference table for the gage of battle. It is based upon the spiritual and Christian ideal of "Peace on earth, good will to men."

America lent her every effort toward the adoption by international agreement of the Kellogg-Briand pact for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy. She believes the ready acceptance by 57 nations of this declaration of national ideals substituting the common sense of calm conference for prejudice and bitter passion marks the parting of the ways between the future and the past.

Another hopeful sign that modern thought and ideals may successfully avoid the danger of international conflict lies in the meeting of the naval conference sitting to-day in London. America is watching with intense interest the negotiations of the five powers, firm in the belief that a successful outcome and understanding will relieve the world not only of serious financial burdens but remove temptations for the use of force in adjusting international disagreements. Should the final result be a reduction, or even the limitation of naval armaments, it would be hailed at home as yet another victory for common sense.

and the nearer approach of a practical world. These movements are the stepping stones over which America seeks to move toward a rationalization of relationships among the nations.

I am conscious that there exists a cynical doubt of the enthronement of such an ideal through so simple a method as the peace pact unsupported by sanctions that would insure performance by the signatory nations. I am conscious that there is a certain condescension to the suggestions of a country but lately come as an active participant in international affairs the importance of whose growth and power entitles it at least to a charitable consideration. Confidence does not everywhere exist that these altruistic ideals can be accomplished. And yet every victory of the conference table will tend to build that confidence, and we at least have an abiding faith in its ultimate fruition.

We have that faith because we are convinced that the pathway of the ideal lies side by side with the pathway of prosperity—that the economic movements of international commerce can not be interrupted without serious consequence in every country—and that the common sense of peoples, once it is aroused, is the most effective sanction that can be placed behind the covenants of nations to assure their full performance.

To trade associations, such as is this chamber, the self-interests of the membership should dictate the most powerful assistance to an economic diplomacy of common sense. The weaving among the nations of a closely interdependent business fabric is a better security for the future than battleships and armament. Klares geschäft macht gute freunde. A thorough understanding of the problem will insure the effective support by commercial interests in every land for national foreign policies based on the economic welfare of the people. It will raise real barriers to those sudden bursts of passion which, in the past, have wrecked the prosperity of many lands.

#### INTERNATIONAL TRADE RELATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the speech of His Excellency Dr. Orestes Ferrara, Cuban ambassador to the United States, at the Southwestern Foreign Trade Conference in Houston, Tex., on yesterday.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Through an evolution of more than a century we have reached a status of commercial relations in the international field very similar in principle to that which provoked the rebellions of the Americas against their respective metropolises. I mean that we have to-day, as we had at the time of George III of England or Ferdinand VII of Spain, political conditions dominating economic interests.

The happy period of the past century when the play of man's efforts freely combined with favorable natural opportunities has been eclipsed by erroneous ideas, and, I believe, for some time the world at large will suffer the consequence of this policy in the same way that the old metropolises suffered when the Americans of both continents secured their independence. "Economics" is a very rebellious steed, which has always unhorsed that cavalier whose name is "politics." But this predominance of the political element over the strictly economic one is generally prevalent.

On the other hand, we assist at another peculiar phenomenon, that everybody in the entire world declares day after day in official conferences of international character, in technical congresses, and also in erudite books and scholarly magazine articles, that the world needs better and closer economic understanding. In this Southwest Foreign Trade Conference we say the same when we advocate the rapprochement of North and South America.

The reality is that we have facts against words, a situation which does not satisfy the practical man, the man who is interested directly in business.

I want to confine myself to a brief consideration of the possibilities of a good, broad, large, honorable, and practical economic understanding among the peoples of the double American Continent. I will present this more as an aspiration than a proposal; more as an idea than as a project.

We must depart from the consideration that the harmony between production of wealth and its distribution is threatened every day more and more. The method of mass production requires the largest possible number of consumers; it requires also a high standard of life. The prevalent nationalistic economies are in disharmony with the mammoth industry of nowadays and hampers the development of the middle class and of the working men. A union of political entities or nations in one economic system seems to be the only solution for the great productive capacity of the present world.

In Europe there is a real aspiration among statesmen toward an organization of that kind. This undoubtedly will be difficult and impossible in its entirety. A single tariff system to embrace all Europe is something which can not at present be considered as a practical, feasible achievement. But equally far from the truth would be he who denied that under the stringency of necessity agreements and understandings of commercial and productive character are in incubation in the Old World, with a tendency to give a new aspect to its economic relations.

The peace of 1918 has created a number of new states which can not progress without lowering considerably their economic barriers; in many zones there are complementary economies which need to be united, because, isolated as they are now, they can not improve or progress. Necessity is the mother of invention. And in Europe everybody knows and remembers that the greatness of Germany after 1870 until 1914 was not due to the three successful wars of 1864, 1866, and 1870, but to the customhouse union among the different states of the confederation.

In the American Continent, however, the adoption of such a customhouse union, or, as the Germans say, "Zollverein," by a number of nations would be a less difficult task. In days past an American nation in a general way contained at least one economic unit; nowadays no American nation can stand alone economically. Each one, even the largest, is a satellite of a larger organization. At this moment the evidence is furnished by the United States, as in Europe it is furnished by Russia. Russia has tried to keep herself aloof, to become a self-supporting country, and with iron hand has restricted the needs of her people. Despite this, Russia every day buys more in the world market. And for Russia to buy in the world market means to destroy her own political structure.

The United States is endowed by Heaven with all resources useful to a superior collective life; its soil and subsoil are prodigal, and notwithstanding this and the high-tariff period, initiated in 1922, the territorial extension, and the large number of inhabitants the United States is buying more, and, what is of a greater importance, needs to sell more in foreign countries than before. The industrial prosperity of the United States depends now upon the buying power of foreign countries.

If this occurs in Russia and the United States, it may easily be deduced that other countries, especially the Latin American, are vitally in need of ever-increasing intereconomic relations. Some figures will indicate how great are the opportunities of a sound and proper understanding on this side of the Atlantic. The import and export commerce between the United States and Latin America amounts to around two billions of dollars, but the general Latin American import and export trade with Europe is much higher than with the United States, practically double, as it amounts to more than thirty-six hundred millions of dollars yearly.

In total, the international commerce of the Latin American countries is approximately six billions of dollars, exports and imports included, and represents a notable amount, although it is smaller than the international trade of the United States alone, which reached the sum of ninety-two hundred and twenty millions of dollars in the year 1928.

On the other hand, Latin America has been developed only in a small way, and her population is increasing enormously. While Europe increased, from the years 1913 to 1927, at the ratio of 6.5 per cent and the United States at the ratio of 23 per cent, South America, especially, has increased its population at a ratio of 40 per cent.

On the day that the rest of the world accords to Latin America fair treatment, with the consequence of developing her resources and increasing the standard of life of her inhabitants, the economic potentiality of that part of the world will be astonishing.

An American customhouse union does not mean that the countries therein should segregate from the rest of the world; we do not believe in such possibility in modern times. A customhouse union would mean better organization of production, larger consumption, and, above all, better and easier distribution of products. The results would be beneficial to everyone, to Europe as to America itself. Higher buying power spreads its benefits over everybody. Such was the case with the United States who were buying less from abroad when they were not so powerfully industrialized as they are now, and with Latin America where the prosperity of recent years has brought about not only internal development but also a larger international trade. The people of the United States, when admiring their success within a century and a half, must bless their forefathers who resisted the desire of local interests to erect customs barriers and morally impelled the former Thirteen Colonies to accept the present Constitution. The fact that the United States itself comprises a large union of States free from customs duties, is the real cause of her ever-increasing prosperity.

Those principles of the United States Constitution, applied exclusively in the economic field, to your country and others of Latin America willing to accept them, would be very beneficial to all concerned. To the United States it would assure the expansion of its industry and of a great part of its agriculture; to the Latin American nations it would provide a larger market for their products with a more prospective increase of their production. Small economic units of Latin American nations combined themselves and with the United States would constitute a powerful system, beneficial to their respective production and consumption, as well as to the rest of the world.

Such an important undertaking would not find great obstacles, because between the two continents of this hemisphere, the islands included, there is no antagonism in the field of production.

Exports have been classified diligently by the convention of Brussels of 1913, and distributed in five classes. According to this classification the United States exports to Latin America are in classes 3 and 4, namely, semimanufactures and finished manufactures, while Latin Ameri-



ca's exports are in classes 1 and 2, namely, crude materials and food-stuffs, especially the so-called colonial products.

Latin America not only exports foodstuffs and raw materials, but in general produces only these raw materials; her industries are not developed at the present moment. In the United States, with the exception of a few articles, the products of Latin America do not compete with domestic products. So far back as 1890 President Harrison, in the message of the 19th of June, 1890, told Congress that 80 per cent of the incoming products of Latin America did not pay duty. The situation to-day is more or less the same. Certainly two or three products are conflicting, but to a very small extent. Take sugar, for instance, which is the most important item. The continental United States produces no more than a million tons, while its general consumption is 6,000,000 tons yearly. Nobody looking for the general interest can consider a situation of this kind as insurmountable.

Under any circumstances, I must add, that in the adoption of a big system like this, of course, everyone would have to make a small sacrifice, but the sacrifice would be insignificant in proportion to the advantages.

The idea I have suggested is not mine; it was in vogue when Pan Americanism began and was attributed to Mr. James Blaine, at that time the powerful Secretary of State of your country, and it has been the vision of clever scholars, of far-sighted statesmen, who penetrated the future. I believe this idea can be considered now as something more practical and in the domain of business men. It is, perhaps, or at least soon will be, an actual necessity.

The principle of a customhouse union is in the atmosphere of the entire world. It is still in the form of an aspiration; but its march is rapid. It will be the only remedy for the dominant economic psychology of selling to other countries without buying from them, the absurdity of which was in vogue at the time of George III and Ferdinand VII, and even before, and which has been the laughing stock of the economic schools.

My desire would have been to speak of the relations between the United States and Cuba, but the picture would have been too sinister for a convention so successful and therefore so optimistic. I should have been obliged to point out that we are witnessing the decrease of our reciprocal trade, that our reciprocal duties are on the increase; that equally the greatest sugar-consuming country near to the greatest sugar-producing country is breaking this neighborly proximity and in consequence a large number of thousands of tons of sugar need now to navigate 7,000 miles before entering the United States. I should have been obliged to say that our sugar crisis is ruining our interests and at the same time yours also. So the once large and prosperous American companies established in Cuba are going into the hands of the receiver one after another; and in our present distress we regard with sympathy those American investors in Cuban businesses who share our disaster and who have seen their investments reduced from one billion and a half to less than seven hundred million.

I thought that a jeremiad of this kind would have been out of place. And I have preferred to look at the future and see in it great possibilities of a far-reaching character.

And as Cuba has been in international politics the test case of the ample and perfect views of the United States, so I hope that she might be the test case on the new horizon of economic Pan Americanism.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10118) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Twelfth National Convention of the American Legion at Boston, Mass., during the month of October, 1930, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 51) to subject certain immigrants, born in countries of the Western Hemisphere, to the quota under the immigration laws.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STECK in the chair). The Senator from Arizona is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, a few days ago, when discussing the matter which the Senator from Arizona has been so ably discussing, I referred to the fact that in 1924, when the immigration bill was before the Senate, former Senator Willis introduced an amendment which he described as "providing in effect that the same rule which applied to the remainder of the world should be applied to the American Continent." I put in the RECORD when I discussed the matter merely the names of Senators now in the Senate who voted for the amendment. I have been requested to place in the RECORD the names of those who voted against the amendment at that time, which I should have done in the first place.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point the report following the ordering of the yeas and nays, showing how Senators voted and the pairs announced and those present and not present at that time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest that the Senator also include the text of the amendment upon which the vote was taken.

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall be glad to have that done, although the text is a little involved, and the reason why I did not give it was that the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Willis, at that time explained the amendment, which was a little difficult to understand, by using the words "the amendment in effect simply provides that the same rule which applies to the remainder of the world shall be applied to the American Continent."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I did not understand to which amendment the Senator from Connecticut was referring.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was referring to the amendment of Senator Willis to the original immigration act. I am asking that the entire roll call be placed in the RECORD to show who voted for the amendment and who voted against it. The other day I merely had the names of certain Senators inserted who are now in the Senate and who voted against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 18, 1924, page 6634]

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROUSSARD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as I heretofore made as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harreld], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. COPENLAND], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ERNST. Making the same announcement of my pair as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON. Has the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Elkins] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. HARRISON. I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia, and withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] has a general pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 60, as follows:

Yeas—12: Messrs. Dial, Harris, Heflin, Mayfield, Neely, Sheppard, Shields, Smith, Underwood, Watson, Wheeler, Willis.

Nays—60: Adams, Ball, Bayard, Brandegee, Brookhart, Broussard, Bruce, Bursum, Cameron, Capper, Caraway, Colt, Curtis, Dale, Dill, Ernst, Fernald, Ferris, Fess, Fletcher, Frazier, Gerry, Gooding, Hale, Howell, Johnson of Minnesota, Jones of New Mexico, Jones of Washington, Kendrick, Keyes, King, Lodge, McKellar, McKinley, McLean, McNary, Norris, Oddie, Overman, Pepper, Phipps, Pittman, Ralston, Reed of Pennsylvania, Robinson, Shipstead, Shortridge, Simmons, Smoot, Spencer, Stanfield, Stephens, Sterling, Swanson, Trammell, Wadsworth, Walsh of Massachusetts, Walsh of Montana, Warren, and Weller.

Not voting—24: Ashurst, Borah, Copeland, Couzens, Cummins, Edge, Edwards, Elkins, George, Glass, Greene, Harreld, Harrison, Johnson of California, Ladd, La Follette, Lenroot, McCormick, Moses, Norbeck, Owen, Ransdell, Reed of Missouri, and Stanley.

So Mr. Willis's amendment was rejected.

Mr. Willis's amendment was, on page 5, to strike out lines 8 to 17, inclusive, in the following words: "And (8) an alien who is eligible to citizenship in the United States, and who was born in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Mexico, Cuba, or Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the countries of Central or South America, or the colonies or dependencies of European countries in Central America, and his wife and his unmarried children under 21 years of age if accompanying or following to join him."

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(8) An alien who has resided continuously for at least five years immediately preceding the time of his verified application for admission to the United States in foreign contiguous territory, and who is authorized by the Secretary of Labor upon such application to enter the United States for the purpose of laboring at a specified occupation for a definite time at a designated place: *Provided*, That not more than 5,000 such aliens shall be within the United States at any one time.

"(9) Aliens habitually crossing and recrossing boundary lines between the United States and foreign contiguous territory upon legitimate pursuits, when in possession of an identification card issued by an immigration official pursuant to such regulations as may be prescribed."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will proceed.

Mr. HAYDEN resumed and concluded the speech begun by him yesterday. The speech entire follows.

*Tuesday, April 15, 1930*

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Mexican quota problem has been solved. The Department of State has accomplished this remarkable result in such a quiet way, without ballyhoo or screaming newspaper headlines, that the country is not aware of the fact.

Many Senators and Representatives in Congress know that during the five fiscal years from July 1, 1924, to June 30, 1929, there were 280,000 Mexicans legally admitted into the United States. That is an average of 56,000 a year, or more than 4,500 a month. I doubt if more than a few of those who are now serving in Congress know that during the first nine months of the present fiscal year the total number of aliens admitted over the Mexican border had been reduced to less than 10,500, or a monthly average of 1,165. Of those who were admitted, only 1,199 were laborers who would come within the quota, or an average of 133 per month. This reduction has taken place pursuant to instructions issued early last year by the State Department to all American consuls in Mexico.

The White House is the greatest and most effective sounding board for publicity that America possesses. Within a week the President of the United States can satisfy every legitimate demand from the American people for the immediate enactment of legislation by Congress imposing a quota on Mexico. There are but four things that the President needs to do:

First. He should let the American people know what has already been accomplished not only in complete accord but with the active approval of the Government of Mexico, to reduce the number of immigrants entering the United States from that country.

Second. The President should publicly commend the officials of the Department of State for issuing the instructions of February 18, 1929, to the American consuls in Mexico which have resulted in such a marked reduction in the number of passport visas issued to immigrants who have sought to depart from that country to enter this.

Third. The President should congratulate the officials of the United States Immigration Service upon their activity in deporting aliens unlawfully in the United States and direct them to be even more vigilant in the performance of that duty.

Fourth. The President should bring to the attention of the Congress and the country, perhaps by a special message, the need for the prompt enactment of legislation to consolidate under the Coast Guard, the present border patrol forces of the Immigration Service, the Customs Service, and the Prohibition Service into an ample and efficient force under unified control which can so effectively watch the Mexican and Canadian borders as to put an end to the existing and notorious evasions of the immigration, prohibition, and other laws.

If the President will immediately do these four things so that the country may know what wide power he now has and that he is determined fully to exercise all of it, the agitation for a Mexican immigration quota will cease. When the American people are furnished with the facts from that high source they will not fail to realize that the passage of such legislation by Congress is now unnecessary.

Taking these steps will also relieve the President of sooner or later being compelled to decide whether to approve or veto a bill to impose such a quota on Mexico, and perhaps the other countries of Latin America. Prompt action on his part will prevent the President from having to face that dilemma.

If he refuses to sign such a bill when it reaches the White House, the President will be severely criticized by many thousands of our citizens who, without knowledge of the true situation, earnestly believe that a quota for Mexico is necessary to end a grave menace to American civilization.

If the President does sign the measure, he will offend the Governments of Mexico and Central and South America with whom he, probably more than any other President, has sought to establish cordial and friendly relations. By that one act all of the beneficial results of his famous "good-will tour" will be destroyed. The people of the Western Hemisphere who live south of the Rio Grande will be quick to resent this discrimination against them.

During all of my 18 years' service in Congress I have consistently supported legislation to restrict immigration. I have voted for every immigration law placed on the statute books during that time. Under the conditions as they existed prior to last year I was ready to vote to impose an immigration quota on all the countries of the Western Hemisphere. In the light of what has been accomplished during the past nine months I am now convinced that the only question which

remains is whether this drastic reduction in Mexican immigration as brought about by the State Department will be maintained. I believe that President Hoover can be trusted to carry on this policy and that he should be given full opportunity to perpetuate it without embarrassment from congressional action.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARAWAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Recurring to the statement made by the Senator from Arizona a moment ago, I wish to inquire whether under existing law the President has the power to make and issue an order consolidating or combining the three branches of the public service which have to do with the enforcement of the immigration law, the enforcement of the prohibition law, and the enforcement of the other law referred to, in respect to the Mexican border? Has the President power under the law to consolidate those three forces?

Mr. HAYDEN. The President does not now possess that power.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. HAYDEN. Legislation which, as I understand, has his indorsement has been introduced in the House of Representatives to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If the Senator will pardon me further, I understood the Senator to state that the President could by appropriate order consolidate those forces?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. My suggestion was that the President should direct the attention of Congress and of the country to the necessity for the enactment of legislation which would give him that power.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. If I may presume further, may I ask the Senator whether he thinks it desirable to consolidate those forces?

Mr. HAYDEN. By all means.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I certainly do.

Mr. HAYDEN. I fully appreciate, Mr. President, that neither the Senate nor the people of the States whom the Senators represent in this body will be satisfied with the mere announcement of these four propositions as a reason for changing their opinion regarding the necessity for imposing an immigration quota on Mexico. Therefore I propose to present reasons to demonstrate that each suggestion is sound and constructive.

What are the facts with respect to the actual reduction during the past fiscal year in the number of immigrants lawfully admitted from Mexico? The State Department has repeatedly furnished this evidence. We now know very definitely that lawful immigration of Mexicans into this country has been reduced during the present fiscal year to one-fourth of its average volume for the five preceding fiscal years. I draw particular attention to the word "lawful" when I make that statement.

Detailed statistics on this point are found in the last table on page 20 of the majority reports on the Johnson bill submitted to the House of Representatives on March 13, 1930. I ask leave at this point to insert the table, which appears in that report, showing that during the fiscal year 1928-29, 31,886 immigrants were admitted from Mexico, an average of 3,986 per month, whereas during the first eight months of the present fiscal year the number was reduced to 9,765, or a monthly average of 1,221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Number of immigration visas issued to Mexicans during the first eight months of the present fiscal year beginning July 1, 1929, with comparisons for the previous fiscal year*

Month	Fiscal year 1929-30	Fiscal year 1928-29
July.....	1,950	4,883
August.....	1,623	5,948
September.....	1,429	4,630
October.....	1,263	3,993
November.....	1,024	2,889
December.....	832	2,569
January.....	864	2,799
February.....	780	4,175
Total (8 months).....	9,765	31,886
Monthly average.....	1,221	3,986

Mr. HAYDEN. The table is followed in the majority report by three short explanatory paragraphs indicating that the stream of immigration of Mexican laborers has now been prac-



tically stopped through administrative measures and without regard to a quota. I read the three paragraphs, as follows:

Average Mexican immigration for the last five completed fiscal years, 56,868 per annum; monthly average, 4,739.

Decrease in rate of Mexican immigration thus shown, 74.7 per cent.

Of the 9,765 immigration visas issued to Mexicans in the 8-month period July, 1929, to February, 1930, inclusive, only 1,125, or 141 per month, were issued to common laborers without a previous residence in the United States. This type of immigration is therefore now entering the United States at a rate of less than 1,700 per annum, as compared with an estimated annual rate of more than 40,000 for the last five completed fiscal years.

Since the date of that report I have received the following letter from Mr. Wilbur J. Carr, Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the latest statistics on immigration from Mexico, which include the figures for the month of March, that were omitted from the House report, not being at the time available to the House Committee on Immigration. Mr. Carr says:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, April 10, 1930.

The Hon. CARL HAYDEN,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: I inclose, as of interest in connection with recent discussions on immigration matters, a memorandum showing the latest statistics regarding the reduction which has been effected in the immigration of Mexicans into this country.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. CARR.

The memorandum submitted by Mr. Carr is as follows:

APRIL 10, 1930.

#### LATEST STATISTICS ON IMMIGRATION FROM MEXICO

Only 726 immigration visas were issued by American consular officers abroad during the month of March, 1930, to natives of Mexico. This, added to such immigration visas issued during the eight previous months, means that only 10,483 Mexicans have immigrated to the United States during the first three quarters of the present fiscal year. In other words, Mexicans are now immigrating at the rate of 13,977 per annum as compared with an average annual rate, according to official statistics of the Department of Labor, of 56,747 for the last five completed fiscal years.

The above figures show that the stricter administrative law-enforcement measures put into effect in Mexico in March, 1929, have resulted in a decrease of 75.3 per cent in immigration from that country without resort to a numerical immigration quota.

For purposes of comparison, monthly figures for issuance of immigration visas during the present fiscal year are given, together with those for the fiscal year 1927-28. The latter year is chosen since it was the last completed fiscal year before the present administrative measures were put into operation and also because it represents a year having approximately the average volume of Mexican immigration during the past five years.

Here follows the table which shows the results as stated above. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Immigration visas issued to natives of Mexico

	Fiscal year 1929-30	Fiscal year 1927-28	Decrease
July.....	1,950	6,583	4,633
August.....	1,623	5,897	4,274
September.....	1,429	4,548	3,119
October.....	1,263	4,030	2,767
November.....	1,024	3,963	2,939
December.....	832	3,743	2,911
January.....	864	3,425	2,561
February.....	772	4,175	3,403
March.....	726	6,081	5,255
April.....		6,334	
May.....		5,001	
June.....		4,393	
Total for year.....		58,173	
Monthly average.....	1,165	4,848	3,683

Mr. HAYDEN. I read further from the memorandum submitted by Mr. Carr, as follows:

The following table, taken from annual reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration, shows the immigration of aliens of Mexican birth into the United States for the five fiscal years since the operation of the immigration act of 1924 (by fiscal year ending June 30):

1925.....	50,602
1926.....	58,012
1927.....	77,162
1928.....	58,456
1929.....	39,501
Total.....	283,733
Average per year.....	56,747
Average per month.....	4,729

Then I quote the concluding paragraph, which is most interesting and which fully justifies the statement I have made to the Senate.

One of the most striking features of the recent decrease in Mexican immigration is that during the past nine months only 1,165 out of the 10,483 total were common laborers without a previous residence in this country. The latter class of Mexican immigration is therefore now entering the United States at a rate of only 1,599 per annum. Only 74 such laborers received visas during March, usually one of the heaviest months in the year for the movement of Mexican labor to this country.

An analysis of the Mexicans who have received visas during the present fiscal year shows the following:

	Per cent
A. Persons going to the United States to attend school.....	14.9
B. Residents of the United States for purposes of regularizing status.....	20.7
C. Other persons who had previously resided in the United States.....	14.8
Total.....	50.4
D. Wives and children of admitted aliens.....	20.8
E. Others.....	28.8
Grand total.....	100.00

Of these classes, A represents aliens who would be nonquota even were a quota imposed on Mexico; B and C would doubtless include a large number who would in many cases be nonquota as returning residents of the United States, and who would in any event not represent new Mexican immigration into the United States. These three classes represent a total of 50.4 per cent of Mexicans now classed as immigrants. Of the remaining 49.6 per cent, 20.8 per cent—of the total—consist of wives and minor children of admitted aliens—class D. This class of Mexicans would be admissible to the United States in any event, outside the quota, if and as soon as their husbands and fathers, respectively, become citizens. Their entry, therefore, would as a rule be only delayed and not definitely stopped by the imposition of a quota, which would merely serve in their cases to delay the reuniting of families.

Eliminating the special classes mentioned as not constituting new immigration from Mexico to the United States, there remains only 28.8 per cent of the total which represents new Mexican immigration of a character which the imposition of a quota would stop. These Mexicans are, of course, the selected few remaining after the elimination of their fellow Mexicans who have failed to qualify in all respects for admission to the United States under our immigration laws.

This class, comprising new Mexican immigration which would be affected by a quota, may therefore be said to be entering the United States at the rate of 302 per month, or 3,628 per annum, gross. The problem of new immigration from Mexico, barring the question of surreptitious border-crossing activities, would therefore no longer appear to be a serious one.

Of the 10,483 immigration visas issued to Mexicans in the nine months—July, 1929, to March, 1930, inclusive—only 1,199, or 133 per month, are estimated as having been issued to common laborers without a previous residence in the United States. This type of new immigration is therefore now coming in at a rate of about 1,600 per annum.

Permit me to observe that under the bill favorably reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Immigration of that body the permanent Mexican quota is fixed at 2,900.

Mexican immigration through legal channels has been reduced administratively from a heavy stream to what is not much more than a mere trickle. Scarcely any Mexican laborers are now coming in legally, and this has been accomplished without a numerical quota.

It should also be considered that the recent figures for Mexican immigration are gross and take no account of the large proportion who return later to Mexico.

A quota would only affect the problem of lawful Mexican immigration, which has already been solved. It would not touch the real problem, that of illegal entries. Let us seek the remedy which will cure the ill and not make an empty gesture of legislating an unnecessary quota to the serious detriment of our relations with Latin America.

<sup>1</sup> Annual reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1925, p. 143; 1926, p. 123; 1927, p. 143; 1928, p. 143; and 1929, p. 137.

It is utterly illogical to say that because large numbers of Mexicans are in this country it must follow that large numbers are entering legally. Such is not the case, and yet such must be the assumption of those who advocate a quota as the unique specific for the ill. The most casual analysis of the present problem shows this to be the case.

The facts I have stated have been recognized by a great newspaper, a member of the Scripps-Howard syndicate, the Washington News, in an editorial published on March 26, 1930, which I ask to have read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky in the chair). Without objection, the editorial will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington News of March 26, 1930]

#### A BETTER WAY

Letting well enough alone seems a better policy concerning Mexican immigration than the Johnson bill, recently reported out by the House Immigration Committee. It would put immigration from Mexico and all countries of the Western Hemisphere on a strict quota basis.

The Department of State recently said its studies indicated that "less than 15,000 Mexicans will enter the United States in the current fiscal year."

Under the Johnson bill Mexican immigration would be scaled down from 11,021 for the fiscal year of 1931 to a final quota of 2,900.

We agree with the minority report of the committee that "the only reason why Mexican immigration was as large as the figures indicated was because our authorities have not been enforcing the literacy test as they have been against immigrants from other countries."

The present law, when enforced as apparently it is being enforced now, is enough check on Mexican and other immigration.

If quota restrictions must be agreed to by Congress, this is not the time to do it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the distinction between legal and illegal Mexican immigration must be always kept clearly in mind. The imposition of a quota on Mexico at the present time would only attempt to solve that part of the Mexican immigration problem which has already been solved by administrative measures, and would, of course, have no reference to the question of further strengthening the border patrol to make illegal entries more difficult.

As to the measures which have been adopted to achieve this recent stoppage in Mexican immigration it may be said briefly that the standards of admissibility in force as regards Mexico prior to 1929 were found to have been not as high as those observed elsewhere, particularly in Europe. This situation was probably a natural outcome of the need of Mexican laborers in this country during the World War and the few years immediately following.

When the situation was fully developed, however, remedies were firmly applied. A rigorous enforcement of existing law has been in effect since March 4, 1929, consisting principally in the refusing of immigration visas by our consuls in Mexico to all aliens found inadmissible under the immigration act of 1917.

That point was brought out very clearly in the statement made before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate April 5, 1930, by Hon. Joseph P. Cotton, Undersecretary of State, who said:

The present immigration law calls for a denial of entrance to anyone who is likely to be a public charge, to contract labor, to illiterates, to physical and mental defectives. So long as that law is enforced you will not have any legal immigration of a substantial amount of people from Mexico.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, from whom is the Senator reading now?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am reading from the testimony of Hon. Joseph P. Cotton, Undersecretary of State.

What are the laws to which Mr. Cotton referred and which have been so well enforced by the American consuls in Mexico? They are practically all found in section 3 of the immigration act of February 5, 1917. I ask leave to insert the most important part of that section in the Record, and direct particular attention to four classes of aliens which are excluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SEC. 3. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons; persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority; persons with chronic alcoholism; paupers; professional beggars; vagrants; persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon

as being mentally or physically defective, such physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living; persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, or persons who practice polygamy or believe in or advocate the practice of polygamy; anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; persons who are members of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or who advocate or teach the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; prostitutes, or persons coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who directly or indirectly procure or attempt to procure or import prostitutes or persons for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who are supported by or receive in whole or in part the proceeds of prostitution; persons hereinafter called contract laborers, who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; persons who have come in consequence of advertisements for laborers printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country; persons likely to become a public charge; persons who have been deported under any of the provisions of this act, and who may again seek admission within one year from the date of such deportation, unless prior to their reembarkation at a foreign port or their attempt to be admitted from foreign contiguous territory the Secretary of Labor shall have consented to their reapplying for admission; persons whose tickets or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who are assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such persons do not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes; persons whose ticket or passage is paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, either directly or indirectly; stowaways, except that any such stowaway, if otherwise admissible, may be admitted in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor; all children under 16 years of age, unaccompanied by or not coming to one or both of their parents, except that any such children may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor, be admitted if in his opinion they are not likely to become a public charge and are otherwise eligible; unless otherwise provided for by existing treaties, persons who are natives of islands not possessed by the United States adjacent to the continent of Asia, situate south of the twentieth parallel latitude north, west of the one hundred and sixtieth meridian of longitude east from Greenwich, and north of the tenth parallel of latitude south, or who are natives of any country, province, or dependency situate on the continent of Asia west of the one hundred and tenth meridian of longitude east from Greenwich and east of the fiftieth meridian of longitude east from Greenwich and south of the fiftieth parallel of latitude north, except that portion of said territory situate between the fiftieth and the sixty-fourth meridians of longitude east from Greenwich and the twenty-fourth and thirty-eighth parallels of latitude north, and no alien now in any way excluded from, or prevented from entering, the United States shall be admitted to the United States. The provision next foregoing, however, shall not apply to persons of the following status or occupations: Government officers, ministers or religious teachers, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, civil engineers, teachers, students, authors, artists, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure, nor to their legal wives or their children under 16 years of age who shall accompany them or who subsequently may apply for admission to the United States, but such persons or their legal wives or foreign-born children who fail to maintain in the United States a status or occupation placing them within the excepted classes shall be deemed to be in the United States contrary to law, and shall be subject to deportation as provided in section 19 of this act.

That after three months from the passage of this act, in addition to the aliens who are by law now excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission thereto, to wit:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish.

Mr. HAYDEN. The first contract labor law was enacted by Congress and approved by the President on February 26, 1885. That law was included in section 3 of the immigration act of February 5, 1917, which was in fact a codification of our previous immigration laws.



The second provision of section 3, and the one, so I am informed, that has resulted in the rejection of the largest number of applications for visas in Mexico, is the provision which states that a person is likely to become a public charge.

The third provision, which has been found particularly applicable to Mexico, prohibits the entry of persons suffering from disease, or physical or mental defects.

And, last but not the least, the literacy test, which reads:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish.

That is a mild but a very effective provision of law so far as Mexico is concerned. There is not now, and there has not been at any time, a widespread system of public schools for the education of the masses of the Mexican people. Particularly is that true of those who come here as common laborers. They are not literate, and under the operation of our immigration law they are not entitled to a visa on their passports.

It must be remembered that the Government of the United States did not begin the practice of visaing foreign passports until 1918. At that time an American consul could not refuse to grant a visa except when he had good reason to believe that the applicant was an anarchist or a believer in the destruction of governments by force.

I was told by a gentleman who served at one time as an American consul in Vienna, Austria, that he was compelled to issue a passport in 1920 to a woman who had been repeatedly convicted of immoral practices, but that there was no way at that time by which he could refuse to grant the visa. It was not until the passage of the immigration act of 1924 that teeth were placed in the law. That act gives very wide discretion to our American consuls.

The immigration act of May 26, 1924, which includes provisions for the present quotas and for the listing of independent countries in the Western Hemisphere as nonquota, contains the following very important paragraph, giving the consular officers for the first time the duty of refusing immigration visas to inadmissible aliens.

This reference is to section 2 (f), which is as follows:

No immigration visa shall be issued to an immigrant if it appears to the consular officer, from statements in the application, or in the papers submitted therewith, that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws, nor shall such immigration visa be issued if the application fails to comply with the provisions of this act, nor shall such immigration visa be issued if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws.

I ask Senators to particularly note the words "has reason to believe." That language is exceedingly broad, and, and, and, as I have stated before, wide discretion in any American consul as to whether or not a visa shall be issued.

Under the authority thus granted, the question of whether or not a given alien is inadmissible is determined under section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917, which contains a complete classification of aliens who are inadmissible, except the class of aliens not of the white or black races who are declared inadmissible under section 13 (c) of the immigration act of 1924.

Section 24 of the immigration act of 1924 provides:

All such rules and regulations in so far as they relate to the administration of this act by consular officers shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State on the recommendation of the Secretary of Labor.

By virtue of the above authority, General Instructions, Consular, No. 926 has been issued, the latest revision of which was made on March 23, 1929. I ask to have printed at this point paragraphs 193, 194, 195, 196, and 197 of these instructions, which deal at some length with the question of refusals of immigration visas to applicants believed to be inadmissible to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

193. The term "immigration laws of the United States," used in this connection, may be taken to include the following acts, although most of the exclusion provisions will be found in section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917:

Act of February 5, 1917: Regulating the immigration of aliens to and residence of aliens in the United States;

Act of December 26, 1920: To provide for the treatment in hospital of diseased alien seamen;

Act of June 5, 1920: Relating to the exclusion of anarchistic and similar classes;

Act of May 10, 1920: To deport certain undesirable aliens;

Act of June 5, 1920: Providing for the admission of certain illiterate female aliens;

Act of May 26, 1922: To deport certain aliens convicted of crime;

Act of February 26, 1885: Contract labor;

Act of February 15, 1893: Suspension of immigration from countries in which cholera or other infectious or contagious diseases exist;

Act of April 29, 1902: Regulating the admission of Chinese and other aliens under contract if engaged in installing or conducting exhibits;

Act of June 25, 1910: The white slave traffic act;

Act of May 26, 1924: Immigration act of 1924 and acts amendatory thereof;

Act of March 4, 1929: An act making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law.

194. Consuls are directed to study the analysis of the exclusion provisions of the immigration laws appearing in Appendix A. If considered necessary, consuls are authorized to have this analysis printed in poster form for ready reference by the officers and employees taking alien applications and examining applicants.

#### DOUBTFUL CASES

195. With the responsibility and authority placed upon consular officers by section 2 (f) of the act, there is no longer any reason to grant an immigration visa to an applicant whose admissibility is doubtful simply because he insists upon it. The intent of Congress is clear on the point of reducing to a minimum the number of aliens to be excluded after their arrival in the United States and forced to make the return journey to their homes. Therefore, if the consul has reason to believe that an applicant is not admissible to the United States under the immigration laws, he must discharge the responsibility placed upon him by Congress and refuse to issue the immigration visa.

196. Special attention is directed to the provision of section 2 (f) of the act that no immigration visa shall be issued to an immigrant (1) "if it appears to the consular officer, from statements in the application or in the papers submitted therewith," or (2) "if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe," that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws. The first provision quoted requires consuls to examine carefully the applications and accompanying papers submitted by prospective immigrants, and the second makes it incumbent upon him to go beyond these documents and to scrutinize the individuals themselves and carefully weigh any information concerning them, with a view to ascertaining whether they are liable to be excluded from the United States under any of the provisions of the immigration laws. Where the consul has a reasonable suspicion that the applicant has made a false statement or that some fact not appearing in the application or accompanying paper exists which renders the applicant inadmissible to the United States, he should defer granting the immigration visa and make investigations to ascertain the truth of the matter. For example, if the consul, from statements made by the applicant or from any other cause, suspects that he is preparing to go to the United States as a contract laborer, he should interrogate him concerning this point, require him to submit any correspondence he may have had with organizations in the United States or abroad in regard to his proposed emigration, and take any other action which seems necessary or desirable in order to ascertain the true facts. Again, if an immigrant submits a physician's certificate stating that he is of sound health, but the consul suspects from the appearance of the applicant or from any other cause that such is not the case, he should require the applicant to be examined by another physician, chosen from a list prepared by the consul.

197. If after such additional examination as seems necessary the consul thinks it likely that the applicant would be rejected if he should arrive at a port of the United States, he should refuse to grant an immigration visa. It is not necessary, to justify his refusal, that he should be able to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the applicant would be subject to exclusion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask leave to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an extract from a memorandum furnished me by the Department of State on January 4, 1929, which states that a conference of consular officers had been called to take corrective measures to insure that all of the provisions of the immigration law relating to the visa of passports would be strictly enforced. That conference was held in the City of Mexico on the 18th of the following February. I am glad to say that every result which was anticipated by the department has been fully realized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ENFORCEMENT OF THE EXISTING IMMIGRATION LAWS

It is believed that a proper enforcement of the present existing immigration laws can and will result in reducing greatly the volume of immigrant laborers recorded as entering lawfully into the United States from Mexico, and if the border control is made effective should go far toward solving the problem under discussion without requiring new legislation, which would involve the serious disadvantages to which reference has already been made.

In making its investigation as to the need for and probable effect of the extension of the quota system to the American countries the department has ascertained that the standards of admissibility under the immigration act of February 5, 1917, which have been observed by consular officers in Mexico since they have been responsible for refusing visas to aliens whom they believe to be inadmissible to the United States under the law, have been materially lower than those observed by consular officers elsewhere, notably in Europe. The department's conclusion in this respect has been based upon information received from its inspector for the district concerned, from reports from officers in the field, from a study of the time given to the examination of applicants for visas in Mexico, and from a comparison of the type of immigration and percentage of refusals in Mexico with those in certain countries of Europe.

#### CONTRACT LABOR

Discussing certain provisions of the existing laws in the order of their probable importance, as far as immigration from Mexico is concerned, mention should first be made of the contract labor clauses of the immigration act of February 5, 1917. For convenience they are quoted as follows:

"That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: \* \* \* persons hereinafter called contract laborers, who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; persons who have come in consequence of advertisements for laborers, printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country."

As is well known, by far the greater part of the present immigration from Mexico comes from the interior of that country and is made up of laborers who have relatively little means. It is reported that advertisements for laborers are commonly circulated in Mexico by American agencies. There is also reason to believe that labor agents are active in that country, and that an important part of the Mexican laborers coming to the United States have been solicited.

Section 2 (f) of the immigration act of 1924 provides that "No immigration visa shall be issued to an immigrant \* \* \* if the consular officer knows or has reason to believe that the immigrant is inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws." Thus, if an applicant for a visa is believed to have been induced to migrate by promises of employment or to have come in consequence of advertisements for laborers, the responsible consul is clearly enjoined to withhold a visa from him. The department considers that sufficient effect has not been given this provision of law by consular officers in Mexico.

#### PERSONS LIKELY TO BECOME PUBLIC CHARGES

Probably the second most important provision of law as far as the present Mexican immigration is concerned is that which declares inadmissible to the United States "persons likely to become a public charge." Sufficient care does not appear to have been exercised in Mexico to require adequate evidence that applicants for immigration visas have sufficient means to insure that they will not become public charges if admitted to the United States. It is considered that a consul should require an applicant for a visa to prove that his earning capacity and his personal resources, or those of his relatives in the United States who are willing to guarantee his support, are such as to preclude his becoming an object of charity while in this country, even though he may at times be incapacitated or without employment. Reports that Mexican immigrants apply in large numbers to charitable institutions for aid would seem to bear out the department's opinion in this respect.

Reference is made in this connection to the extension of remarks of the Hon. JOHN C. BOX, of Texas, on May 23, 1928, as published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1928 [permanent RECORD of May 23, 1928], and particularly to a statement quoted therein from a report of the California Commission of Immigration and Housing appearing on page 10891 [9615] of the RECORD, of which the following is a part:

"The Mexicans as a general rule become a public charge under slight provocation and have become a great burden to our communities.

"In Los Angeles, where approximately 7 per cent of the population is Mexican, the outdoor relief division states that 27.44 per cent of its cases are Mexican. The bureau of Catholic charities reports that 53 per cent of its cases are Mexicans, who consume at least 50 per cent of the budget. Twenty-five per cent of the budget of the General Hospital is used for Mexicans, who comprise 43 per cent of its cases. The city maternity service reports 62½ per cent of its cases Mexicans, using 73 per cent of its budget. The bureau of municipal nursing and division of child welfare both state that 40 per cent of their clients are Mexican, and in the day home of the Children's Hospital 23 per cent of the children cared for are Mexican, while 12 per cent of the out-patient department cases are Mexican."

#### PROBABLE CAUSES

It appears that the condition described has not been due to any deliberate failure on the part of consular officers in Mexico to give full effect to the law, but rather to an entirely different conception of what the law required. This seems to have been brought about by the nature and volume of immigration from that country. Without doubt Mexican labor was badly needed in the border States in the post-war period, and everything possible appears to have been done to facilitate its entry. Accordingly, precedents were established which led to the present apparent divergence in the standards applied in Mexico and those observed elsewhere.

In illustration of this point reference is made to the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1921, from which the following excerpt is quoted:

"At an early stage of the war it became apparent that in certain parts of the country there was a serious shortage of agricultural laborers essential to the production of foodstuffs and cotton. Strictly as a matter of war policy, and by virtue of the authority of the ninth proviso to section 3 of the general immigration act, it was determined to waive certain provisions of the immigration requirements and admit, temporarily and conditionally, a limited number of such laborers from Mexico. Authority for the admission of this class of aliens was terminated on March 2, 1921, and the importers were called upon to return to Mexico all such aliens then in their employ. The return movement is still under way, extensions having been granted by the department, upon application, in certain especially meritorious cases.

"The total number of aliens admitted under the department's exceptions during the years 1917 to 1921, inclusive, was 72,862. Of this number, 34,922 have returned to Mexico, 414 died, 494 were examined for permanent residence, found eligible for admission under the immigration laws, paid head tax, and were admitted; 21,400 deserted their employment and disappeared; and, so far as can be ascertained, 15,632 are still in the employ of the original importers. Of those who deserted their employment and disappeared, it is likely that a considerable percentage have found their way back to Mexico, owing to the present slight demand for that class of labor in the border States."

Further reference is made in this connection to the arrangements made several years ago to permit Mexican laborers to regularize their status in the United States by paying the head tax. (See pp. 5659 to 5666 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (House) of March 18, 1926.)

It will be seen, therefore, that the method of dealing with Mexican immigration was a matter of natural development, influenced by conditions on both sides of the border, and that the possibility of a material difference in standards did not suggest itself. Neither consular officers nor the department had occasion heretofore to compare the general practice in Mexico with that in other countries.

#### CORRECTIVE MEASURES

As soon as it was definitely ascertained that the practice in Mexico was below the standard of the service immediate steps were taken to rectify the situation. Appropriate instructions were issued to the supervising consul general at Mexico City and plans have been made to take energetic measures to effect the result desired. A conference of consular officers in Mexico has been called, and in due course an inspection of each office will be made with a view to insuring that the department's instructions are being properly carried out.

#### RESULTS ANTICIPATED

It will, of course, take some time to effect the necessary changes in the procedure of administrative offices in Mexico. It is too soon as yet to expect marked results. It may be mentioned, however, that some decrease in the volume of visas issued is already to be noted, although it took place before the counsel general at Mexico City advised the officers under his jurisdiction of the purport of the department's instructions just mentioned, and was due to certain preliminary steps which have been taken and to other causes. The department's records indicate that 68,484 nonquota immigration visas were issued to Mexicans under the provisions of section 4 (c) of the immigration act of 1924 during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1927, while 58,110 were issued during the last fiscal year. This represents a decrease of 10,374, or over 15 per cent. That the tendency to decrease has continued is evidenced by the fact that the number of such visas issued to Mexicans during the first five months of the present fiscal year—July to November—was less than that for the corresponding period last year, the totals being 22,343 and 24,994, respectively, while the total issued in November, 1928, was 2,889, which was over 1,000 less than the total for November, 1927—3,936.

While some effect of the measures already taken by the department should be noted during the present quarter ending December 31, it is expected that it will be March or April before its complete program can be carried out, and that the volume of immigration should tend to decrease during the next year or 18 months.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the action taken at this conference in the City of Mexico in February of last year was not a discrimination against Mexicans in any sense, but was merely a question of bringing the standards observed by American ad-



ministrative officials there up to those observed elsewhere, notably, in Europe.

It may, therefore, be said that the class of Mexican immigration which a quota would affect—namely, legal immigration—is no longer a serious problem, and that the administrative steps which have been taken in this respect will be maintained in the future.

Let me repeat that during the past nine months only 1,165, or 133 per month, new Mexican laborers received immigration visas to come to this country. This type of immigration is, therefore, now entering the United States at a rate of less than 1,600 per annum, as compared with an estimated annual rate of more than 40,000 for the last five completed fiscal years.

In order to reemphasize that fact, I ask leave to include in the RECORD a press release from the visa office of the Department of State prepared on January 29, 1930, which gives the figures up to and including the end of the last calendar year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
VISA OFFICE,  
January 29, 1930.

IMMIGRATION OF MEXICANS, JULY-DECEMBER, 1929, INCLUSIVE

The success with which American consular officers in Mexico have responded to the Department of State's program, outlined in a consular conference held at Mexico City on February 18, 1929, for an enforcement of the restrictive features of the immigration laws equal in strictness to that observed in Europe and elsewhere is amply attested by the comparative figures for nonquota visas issued to Mexicans during the first six months of the present fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1929, showing a decrease of 71.4 per cent as compared with the average figures for the past five years, or an annual rate of 16,242.

The monthly figures for immigration visas issued to Mexicans are as follows, with comparisons for the previous year:

Month	1929	1928
July.....	1,950	4,883
August.....	1,623	5,948
September.....	1,429	4,630
October.....	1,263	3,993
November.....	1,024	2,889
December.....	832	2,569
Total.....	8,121	24,912
Monthly average.....	1,354	4,152

It should be noted in this connection that the total number of immigration visas issued to Mexicans during the five completed fiscal years since the enactment of the immigration act of 1924 was 284,338, an average of 56,868 per annum of 4,739 per month. The monthly average so far during the present fiscal year has been 1,354, a decrease of 71.4 per cent, or a rate which would give 16,242 per annum. Complete figures for the period in question are as follows (by fiscal years ending June 30):

1925.....	50,601
1926.....	58,423
1927.....	77,155
1928.....	58,146
1929.....	40,013
Total.....	284,338
Average per year.....	56,868

It may, therefore, be said that through the concerted efforts of American consular officers in Mexico the immigration of natives of that country has been reduced to 28.6 per cent of its former volume.

In analyzing the immigration of Mexicans during the six-month period July-December, 1929, inclusive, 8,121 visas were issued and 6,972 (46.2 per cent) were refused. This does not take into consideration a large number of Mexicans who, recognizing their inability to qualify for admission under the likelihood to become public charge, illiteracy, contract labor, or physical defect clauses of the law, withheld their requests for visas.

A separation of the 8,121 Mexicans who received visas during this period into classes affords an interesting analysis of Mexican immigration. The following analysis has been made:

	Number	Per cent
A. Persons going to the United States to attend school.....	1,213	14.9
B. Residents of the United States, for purpose of regularizing status.....	1,713	21.1
C. Other persons who had previously resided in the United States.....	1,188	14.7
Total.....	4,114	50.7
D. Wives and children of admitted aliens.....	1,716	21.1
E. Others.....	2,291	28.2
Grand total.....	8,121	100.0

Of the above classes, A represents aliens who would be nonquota even were a quota imposed on Mexico; B and C would doubtless include a large number who would in many cases be nonquota as returning residents of the United States and who would in any event not represent new Mexican immigration into the United States. These three classes represent a total of 50.7 per cent of Mexicans now classed as immigrants. Of the remaining 49.3 per cent 21.1 per cent (of the total) consist of wives and minor children of admitted aliens (class D). This class of Mexicans would be admissible to the United States in any event outside the quota if and as soon as their husbands and fathers, respectively, become citizens. Their entry, therefore, would, as a rule, be only delayed and not definitely stopped by the imposition of a quota, which would merely serve in their cases to delay the reuniting of families.

Eliminating the special classes mentioned as not constituting new immigration from Mexico to the United States, there remains only 28.2 per cent of the total which represents new Mexican immigration of a character which the imposition of a quota would stop. These Mexicans are, of course, the selected few remaining after the elimination of their fellow Mexicans who have failed to qualify in all respects for admission to the United States under our immigration laws.

This class, comprising new Mexican immigration which would be affected by a quota, may therefore be said to be entering the United States at the rate of 382 per month, or 4,584 per annum. The problem of new immigration from Mexico, barring the question of surreptitious border-crossing activities, would therefore no longer appear to be a serious one.

Notable reductions in the monthly issue of immigration visas to Mexicans really began in the month of March, 1929, as shown by the following table:

Month	1929	1928	Reduction
January.....	2,799	3,425	616
February.....	2,836	4,175	1,339
March.....	1,825	6,081	4,256
April.....	2,548	6,334	3,786
May.....	2,856	5,001	2,145
June.....	2,237	4,893	2,156
July.....	1,950	4,883	2,933
August.....	1,623	5,948	4,325
September.....	1,429	4,630	3,201
October.....	1,263	3,993	2,730
November.....	1,024	2,889	1,865
December.....	832	2,569	1,737

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator gave figures as to the number of Mexican laborers who have entered. Has the Senator the figures as to the number of other Mexicans, not laborers, who were permitted to enter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I gave a complete statement of all the facts.

Mr. DILL. In the earlier part of the Senator's remarks?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; and I shall be very glad to furnish the Senator with a copy of the document giving that information.

Mr. DILL. Never mind, as long as it is in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYDEN. I also have a press statement released on April 11, 1930, by the Department of Labor which contains a table showing the arrival and departure of aliens. Some very interesting figures are presented here. It is shown that from July, 1929, to February, 1930, Mexico stood seventh among the nations from which immigrants came to the United States. The first race of people mentioned are the English, of whom 24,461 entered; second, Germans, 22,837; third, Irish, 21,708; fourth, Scotch, 18,108; fifth, Italian, 16,256; sixth, French, 10,634; and seventh, Mexicans, 9,771.

The statistics as to those who departed from the United States are even more remarkable. Mexico heads the list. From July, 1929, to February, 1930, there left the United States 4,648 Mexicans. Subtracting 4,648 from 9,771, the number who entered, we find that the net increase in the Mexican population of the United States for the 8-month period was 5,123. Forty-seven and one-half per cent of the number of Mexicans who entered departed from the United States in that period.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENDRICK. In connection with the figures as to the Mexicans who returned to their own country, does not the Senator believe that a very much greater number of Mexicans returned of whom there was no official record?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite convinced of that. I have some interesting figures which I desire to present to the Senate on that particular point, consisting of a comparison between the records kept by our Government of the number of Mexicans who returned, and the records kept by the Mexican Government.

Mr. KENDRICK. Because of the long border line, and the fact that Mexicans would feel very much more secure in returning to their own country than they would in coming to this country originally, I think it very likely that thousands would return of whom nothing was known and nothing was said.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure that the Senator is correct in that statement. It is particularly significant that the net increase in the number of Mexicans in the United States of all characters—I am not referring now merely to laborers but to Mexican immigrants of all kinds, students, wives, children, Mexicans who had previously been in the United States and had a lawful right to return here—amounted during the eight months, according to these figures of the Immigration Service, to an average of 637 a month, which is a tremendous reduction in comparison with the statistics of previous fiscal years.

Mr. KENDRICK. Does not the Senator believe an authorized conference with the Government of Mexico would conduce to a friendly settlement between the two nations fixing the quota of Mexicans, without any authority of law?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to say to the Senator that what has been accomplished by our State Department has been done with the full knowledge and consent of the Mexican Government, with the remarkable results which I have already stated. A further formal conference might be held, but the facts I have presented really make such a meeting unnecessary.

Mr. KENDRICK. Is it not true, in the Senator's opinion, that Mexico would be as much interested in limiting migration of Mexicans to our country as we are in such limitation?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the precise attitude of the Mexican Government and has been for some years past.

I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD the table to which I have referred, prepared by the United States Immigration Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 5.—Immigrant aliens admitted and emigrant aliens departed during February, 1930, and from July 1, 1929, to February 28, 1930, by race or people

Race or people	Immigrant		Emigrant	
	February, 1930	July, 1929 to February, 1930	February, 1930	July, 1929 to February, 1930
Total.....	13,585	165,322	3,180	35,774
African (black).....	85	1,109	43	606
Armenian.....	44	604	3	39
Bohemian and Moravian (Czech).....	40	475	44	303
Chinese.....	56	767	103	2,220
Cuban.....	51	1,639	75	909
Dutch and Flemish.....	362	2,817	81	642
English.....	1,712	24,461	330	4,459
French.....	512	10,634	150	1,365
German.....	2,299	22,837	118	4,251
Greek.....	248	2,765	38	511
Hebrew.....	827	8,088	4	207
Irish.....	1,780	21,708	98	1,386
Italian.....	1,244	16,256	354	2,285
Japanese.....	28	515	117	685
Magyar.....	106	1,074	42	501
Mexican.....	772	9,971	497	4,648
Polish.....	380	3,197	147	1,328
Portuguese.....	52	506	9	263
Russian.....	101	1,149	32	354
Scandinavian (Norwegians, Danes, and Swedes).....	353	5,443	235	2,056
Scotch.....	1,090	18,108	157	1,365
Slovak.....	312	2,395	24	635
Spanish.....	53	853	127	1,206
Spanish-American.....	162	2,155	118	1,193
Welsh.....	68	1,487	9	112
All others.....	338	4,509	225	2,286

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I also desire to direct attention to a part of a statement issued by the commissioner general, the Hon. Harry E. Hull, at the time this table was given to the press, which shows that for the first eight months of the current fiscal year 165,322 immigrant aliens entered the United States, of which 10,329, or 6.2 per cent, came from Mexico. Then the commissioner general proceeds to compare these figures with those of the previous fiscal year, which show that the Mexican immigration during that 12 months' period just preceding amounted to 16.7 per cent of our total immigration.

I ask that the paragraph be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There was a drop in immigration of 17,445, or 9.5 per cent, for the first eight months of the current fiscal year, as compared with the cor-

responding period of the preceding year, but Europe and Canada are now contributing a larger proportion of the total. From July 1 to February 28 last, when 165,322 immigrant aliens entered the country, 95,607, or 57.8 per cent, came from European countries; 46,922, or 28.4 per cent, from Canada; 10,329, or 6.2 per cent, from Mexico; 3,725, or 2.3 per cent from the West Indies; 3,199, or 1.9 per cent, from Asia; and 5,540, or 3.4 per cent, from other countries. During the same months a year ago 182,767 immigrants came to the United States. Europe contributing 98,660, or 54 per cent; Canada 43,142, or 23.6 per cent; Mexico, 30,588, or 16.7 per cent, the West Indies 2,521, or 1.4 per cent; Asia 2,516, or 1.4 per cent; and other countries 5,340, or 2.9 per cent.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the figures given by the Department of Labor for net Mexican immigration during the eight months from July, 1929, to February, 1930, show that such net immigration amounted to 5,123. This figure refers only to legally recorded immigrants and emigrants. There is, of course, a very large but unknown number of illegal entries and departures of which no record has been made.

Another very interesting phase of this situation is the number of Mexicans who have been deported during the 8-month period. Exact figures for this period are not available. During the previous fiscal year the total number of deportations amounted to 19,908, of which 5,481 were deported to Mexico.

The Department of Labor estimates that of the 10,000 aliens deported during the first eight months of the present fiscal year about half were Mexicans. They also estimate that 5,000 more Mexicans who were found at places near the border to be here illegally have been allowed to depart voluntarily in lieu of deportation.

This means that nearly 10,000 Mexicans who are not included in the figure of 4,648 emigrants also left the United States, either through formal deportation proceedings or by voluntary departure in lieu thereof, which would indicate that, barring unrecorded border-crossing activities, the net flow of Mexicans during the 8-month period covered was very decidedly southward.

This net southward movement, which may be estimated on the above figures as between 4,000 and 5,000 for the 8-month period covered was doubtless due in a large measure to the effects of the deportation act of March 4, 1929, and will probably not continue on such a large scale in future years. Since, however, the northward legal movement of Mexicans has now been successfully and permanently checked by administrative action it is evident that the problem of Mexican immigration has already been solved without resort to a quota. This is the most important development in our immigration situation and is unfortunately one which certain persons, intrigued by the catchword formula of "Put Mexicans under the quota" have not been willing to admit as true, yet such is the case.

These figures from our own Immigration Service also tend to confirm the often-repeated assertion that large numbers of Mexicans do return to their own country after having secured employment for a time in the United States. The Mexican Government also keeps a record of the arrival and departure of its citizens. In 1928, pursuant to instructions from the State Department, Mr. George H. Winters, of the American Consulate General in the city of Mexico, made an analysis of the Mexican migration statistics.

I have here a memorandum from the State Department which is based on Mr. Winters's report which shows that according to the records of the Mexican Government a larger number of Mexicans have entered the United States and a very much larger number have returned than are shown by the records of the United States Immigration Service.

I am sure that if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] will read this memorandum from the State Department he will find in it a confirmation of the statement he has just made to the Senate. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum is as follows:

#### MEXICAN MIGRATION STATISTICS

Not having comprehensive statistics compiled by this Government from which the net immigration from Mexico can be computed, our consular officers there were instructed to request information of the competent Mexican authorities as to the bases and methods of compilation of the migration statistics of that country. It was learned that the immigration and emigration law of the United States of Mexico of March 12, 1926, requires that a complete record of immigration and emigration and of the return of Mexican citizens to Mexico be kept, and that every foreigner or Mexican entering or leaving the country must be provided with an individual identification card. It was reported that the figures



showing the number of Mexicans leaving for the United States and returning to Mexico are now based on identification card records kept at 25 points on the Mexican-American border.

The classes included in the count comprehend all Mexicans except those who prove that they will not remain in the United States longer than one month and those who upon their return prove that they have not remained longer than the period mentioned, and residents of the border zone who cross in the ordinary pursuit of regular business. The data on the identification cards is consolidated and reported to Mexico City every 15 days. The consular officers reporting agree that, while at times in the past all migrants may not have been accurately tabulated, a careful record is now being maintained of all Mexicans leaving and returning to Mexico, and that the statistics based thereon are worthy of considerable confidence.

The following table shows (1) the number of Mexican citizens departing for the United States according to the Mexican migration service statistics, (2) the number of persons of the Mexican race recorded by the American immigration authorities as entering the United States for permanent residence, and (3) the number of Mexican citizens returning to Mexico from the United States according to the figures of the Mexican Government:

Year	(1) Mexicans entering United States (figures Mexican migration service for calendar years)	(2) Mexicans admitted fiscal years ended June 30 (Department of Labor statistics)	(3) Mexicans returning from United States (figures Mexican migration service for calendar years)
1910	24,203	17,760	34,696
1911	33,384	18,784	35,395
1912	55,745	22,001	55,684
1913	32,826	10,954	29,312
1914	7,295	13,089	8,306
1915	6,113	10,993	13,758
1916	40,859	17,198	37,612
1917	18,089	16,438	92,822
1918	33,672	17,602	30,563
1919	46,060	28,844	40,428
Total, 1910-1919	298,266	173,663	387,486
1920	50,569	51,042	64,620
1921	9,165	29,603	106,242
1922	33,180	18,246	50,171
1923	80,793	62,709	85,825
1924	57,269	87,648	105,834
1925	41,759	32,378	77,056
1926	56,534	42,638	67,970
1927	72,768	66,766	67,818
Total 1920-27	402,037	391,030	625,536
Total 1910-27	700,304	564,693	1,013,022

<sup>1</sup> Estimated. Equals total emigration of Mexicans less 10.6 per cent, which is the average deduction for previous 16 years to find those destined for the United States.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated. Equals total number of Mexicans returning to Mexico less 8 per cent, which is the average deduction for previous 16 years to find those coming from the United States.

Sources of information: Columns (1) and (3)—Report dated May 4 to 10, 1928, from American consulate general, Mexico City, entitled "Migration of Mexicans to and from the United States." Column (2)—Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1927, table 81, pp. 200, 201, and 202.

From the above table it will be noted that the number of Mexicans reported as returning to Mexico exceed those recorded as entering the United States both for the decade 1910 to 1919 and the period 1920 to 1927. There was a material difference between the Mexican and American figures covering the immigration of Mexicans into the United States from 1910 to 1919, but there is substantial agreement in the statistics of the two Governments during the 8-year period from 1920 to 1927, there being a divergence of less than 3 per cent between the totals. Since the Mexican migration service figures covering departures for the United States during the period last mentioned would appear to be quite accurate, the total of 625,536 given by that authority as the number of Mexicans returning to Mexico during the same period would seem to merit some credence.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I stated to the Senator from Wyoming that the Mexican Government has entirely approved of the activities of American consuls in that country in refusing to visa passports unless all the requirements of the immigration laws of the United States have been fully complied with. The Government of Mexico desires that Mexicans shall remain at home. With peace and good order they will be needed there, and it is a legitimate hope, which I believe can be realized by the Government of Mexico, that peace will be permanently established in that country. Certainly we should do nothing on our side of the international boundary line to interfere with so high and so worthy an object.

I have here a clipping from the New York Times of February 26, 1928, which reads as follows:

MEXICO WARNS WORKERS—ADVISES THEM NOT TO SEEK JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mexican newspapers report that in view of the unemployment prevailing in a large part of the United States would-be Mexican emigrants are being advised in an official circular sent out from Mexico City not to venture north of the Rio Grande.

Wide distribution of this official warning is said to have resulted already in a diminution of the number of Mexican laborers seeking to try their luck in the sister Republic. It is also pointed out that if the flow of workers to the United States can be checked by Mexico itself there is less probability of the quota system being extended to cover Mexican emigrants.

I do not know whether the newspaper article refers to an official statement issued by the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1928, but presume that it does. I invite particular attention to one paragraph, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD in italics. This is from an official publication of the Government of Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. The paragraph to which I call particular attention and which I wish to have printed in italics is as follows:

*The exodus of our people to foreign parts, and especially to the United States, for reasons of propinquity and labor, constitutes an intricate problem difficult to solve, alien to the will of the Government of Mexico, which, on the contrary, is constantly making every possible effort practically and theoretically to prevent both the depopulation of our fields and the difficulties which our emigrants are going to encounter.*

I ask now that the entire article may be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

(La migración y protección de Mexicanos en el extranjero: Mexico, Imprenta de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1928, pp. 5-7)

From time to time the press receives certain notices with regard to the condition of the Mexicans in the United States of America, notices which, perhaps on account of the manner in which they are presented, are given publicity and even, in some cases, the special consideration of editorial comment. The very nature of these notices makes it impossible for the Government to be constantly rectifying, explaining, or denying them, especially since in official documents, published and easy to obtain, and even in the bulletins habitually furnished the press, the information and explanations relative to this matter are given.

It would be well for the institutions and persons who are interested in this question to avoid the confusion which frequently arises out of the confounding of the situation in which our nationals who emigrate to the United States may find themselves, and the protection which the Government of Mexico gives them—two matters which, although apparently correlative, are different.

Before turning to a detailed explanation of the question, the public should know: First, the disproportional and illegal emigration of our people to the United States is prejudicial both to our country and to the Mexican laborers; second, no government repatriates its nationals, especially when it is a matter of imprudent journeys, with the exception of mobilization in case of war; third, no other government in the world gives to its nationals abroad the direct protection, in quantity and quality, that is given by the Government of Mexico.

*The exodus of our people to foreign parts, and especially to the United States, for reasons of propinquity and labor, constitutes an intricate problem difficult to solve, alien to the will of the Government of Mexico, which, on the contrary, is constantly making every possible effort practically and theoretically to prevent both the depopulation of our fields and the difficulties which our emigrants are going to encounter.*

Despite these efforts great numbers of field laborers always ignore the dispositions of the governments on both sides of the Rio Grande; they accept, without weighing the consequences, disadvantageous contracts and go to various States of the American Union, where, once the harvest season is over, they remain sometimes at the mercy of unscrupulous exploiters and sometimes without employment with which to earn their livelihood, often persecuted with the provisions of the immigration law, incarcerated as a consequence of their offense or deported in mass rapidly.

These are the consequences of imprudent emigration. Only then is it that these persons who enter another country in defiance of the laws of their own and the foreign nation turn to their government and ask for what it is impossible to foresee in any budget—food, transportation, and various other expenses for many thousands of individuals.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not only has the Mexican Government heartily cooperated with our own Government in its efforts

to raise the standard for granting visas by our consuls but that Government has pursued the identical policy in issuing instructions to Mexican consuls abroad. I read from a publication entitled "Industrial and Labor Information," dated June 24, 1929, an article entitled "Immigration Suspended in Mexico," as follows:

The President of the Mexican Republic, in exercise of the power conferred on him by the immigration act, has temporarily prohibited the entry into the country of foreign workers without distinction of nationality. This measure came into force on May 1, 1929.

According to a circular addressed to Mexican consuls abroad this position was adopted in view of the severe unemployment existing in the country, which has reduced a number of Mexican workers and their families to a condition of destitution. Mexican consuls are required to refuse to emigrants desiring to enter Mexico for the purpose of earning a living by manual labor, the identity card required by the immigration authorities.

Let me repeat that Mexico has directed her consuls abroad to do exactly what our Government has directed American consuls abroad to do—that is, to refuse to visa a passport or to refuse to issue an identity card, so that workers who intended to come to Mexico seeking employment could not enter that country for the lack of necessary credentials. Therefore the Government of Mexico can not possibly have the slightest objection to the regulations issued by our State Department and to the instructions sent to our consuls in Mexico, because that Government has done the same identical thing with respect to its own consuls throughout the world.

Cooperation between nations with respect to laborers living in other countries has been frequent in the past. Many nations have arranged for either the restriction of immigration by mutual consent or provided for mutual agreements that reciprocal advantages may be enjoyed by the working men of one country temporarily residing in the other. I have here a list of labor treaties prepared by the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress which I ask to have included in my remarks as an illustration of the constantly recurring efforts made by various countries for a settlement of the labor difficulties similar to those which have been experienced by the United States and Mexico in recent years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

#### CITATIONS TO LABOR TREATIES

The following citations to labor treaties do not include those general commercial treaties which provide for mutual privileges and security of nationals in the States of the contracting parties.

Labor treaty between France and Italy. September 30, 1919. League of Nations, treaty series, volume 5, page 281.

Declaration between France and Italy relative to suspension of the immigration of workmen in the event of economic troubles or disorders. September 30, 1919. British and Foreign State Papers, volume 112, page 1048. (The only available text is in French.)

Additional declaration to the labor treaty of September 30, 1919, regarding Italian workers in Alsace-Lorraine. February 19, 1920. Treaty series, volume 8, page 42.

Convention between the Argentine Republic and Italy providing compensation for accidents to workmen. March 26, 1920. British and Foreign State Papers, volume 113, page 878. (No copy available.)

Treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between Mexico and China. December 14, 1899. British and Foreign State Papers, volume 92, page 1061, Article XII.

Exchange of notes between China and Mexico, embodying an agreement for the provisional modification of the Sino-Mexican treaty of December 14, 1899. September 26, 1921. Treaty series, volume 13, page 202.

Convention between Italy and the United States of Brazil concerning emigration and labor, October 8, 1921. Treaty series, volume 16, page 15.

Protocol regarding the regulation of the workmen's traffic on the Saar-German frontier. September 14, 1926. Treaty series, volume 77, page 164.

Danish-Finnish declaration concerning workmen's insurance against accidents. March 30, 1923. Treaty series, volume 20, page 429.

Arrangement between Finland and Sweden regarding the insurance of workers against accident. September 11, 1923. Treaty series, volume 20, page 81.

Germany-Czechoslovakia, convention and final protocol concerning conditions and social insurance of crews of vessels navigating on the Oder and ceded by Germany to Czechoslovakia. December 15, 1924. Treaty series, volume 52, page 31. (Similar provisions concerning crews on the Elbe, vol. 52, p. 11.)

Convention of reciprocity between Norway and the Netherlands with regard to payment of compensation to seamen and industrial workers in case of accidents. January 9, 1925. Treaty series, volume 48, page 253.

Convention between Great Britain and North Ireland and Denmark concerning workmen's compensation for accidents arising out of employment of the subjects of each country in the territory of the other. November 18, 1925. Treaty series, volume 61, page 354.

Convention between the Republic of Estonia and the Republic of Finland concerning workmen's compensation for accidents. December 10, 1925. Treaty series, volume 50, page 337.

Belgium-Netherlands, insurance against accidents sustained in the course of employment. February 22, 1926. Treaty series, volume 54, page 389.

Convention between Belgium and the Netherlands concerning insurance against accidental injuries. Exchange of notes concerning the transmission of requests for legal assistance provided for in Article VI of the convention of 1926. Treaty series, volume 54, page 389.

Norway-Netherlands, convention for payment of compensation to seamen and industrial workers in case of accident. May 14, 1926, volume 48, page 247.

France-Poland, convention respecting reciprocal emigration [of workmen]. September 3, 1919. Treaty series, volume 1, page 338.

Convention between the Argentine Republic and the Kingdom of Italy concerning reciprocity in the payment of workmen's accident compensation. March 26, 1920. Treaty series, volume 15, page 277.

Mr. HAYDEN. One of the treaties cited in that list is an agreement between the United States of Mexico and the Republic of China, with respect to the immigration of laborers of the two respective countries. I invite particular attention to the following articles of the agreement:

So long as the Mexican Government prohibits the immigration of foreign laborers, each of the two high contracting parties prohibits her citizens of the laborer classes to enter the national territory of the other.

Hereafter the emigration of Chinese laborers to Mexico can only be carried out with the approval of the Governments of China and Mexico and is subject to the necessary conditions to be decided upon by the two governments.

Those individuals who might come to Mexico with the sole purpose of being employed in manual labor, and are provided without any amount of capital, but to depend upon the product of the energy of their arms for living are to be considered as laborers.

For the information of the Senate I ask that the 14 articles of this agreement, omitting the exchange of notes, be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles are as follows:

#### ARTICLE 1

It is agreed between the Government of the Republic of China and the Government of the United States of Mexico that the term of the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, entered into between China and Mexico and signed at Washington on the 14th day of December, 1899, shall be extended until a definitive and formal amendment of the said treaty will be made by the two high contracting parties by the regular procedure as required by the constitutions of the two countries. The expected amendment shall be made at the earliest possible date.

The two high contracting parties further express the wish that the expected definitive and formal amendment to the said treaty will be based on the sense and spirit of the present note.

#### ARTICLE 2

So long as the Mexican Government prohibits the immigration of foreign laborers, each of the two high contracting parties prohibits her citizens of the laborer classes to enter the national territory of the other.

#### ARTICLE 3

Hereafter the emigration of Chinese laborers to Mexico can only be carried out with the approval of the Governments of China and Mexico and is subject to the necessary conditions to be decided upon by the two Governments.

#### ARTICLE 4

Those individuals who might come to Mexico with the sole purpose of being employed in manual labor, and are provided without any amount of capital, but to depend upon the product of the energy of their arms for living, are to be considered as laborers.

#### ARTICLE 5

Those citizens of the high contracting parties who are not laborers or workmen are not included in the above restrictive dispositions, and they shall be governed according to the provisions of the existing



treaty between China and Mexico and the laws applied to the nationals of the nonlaborer classes of all other friendly nations.

However, for the sake of avoiding possible difficulties, it is agreed between the two Governments that the citizens of one of the high contracting parties who are to enter the national territory of the other high contracting party with the purpose of engaging themselves in commercial business and are provided with a capital amounting to 500 pesos Mexican currency are not included in the above restrictive dispositions. Likewise, those who are to enter the national territory of one of the high contracting parties for the purpose of engaging themselves in any kind of work which may be called intellectual work, and travelers and students or apprentices who are provided with reliable financial support, are not included in the above restrictive dispositions.

#### ARTICLE 6

The public officials of the high contracting parties, their families, suite, and servants are not included in the restrictive dispositions.

#### ARTICLE 7

Those citizens of one high contracting party, no matter whether they are laborers or nonlaborers, who have already been admitted to the national territory of the other high contracting party but have been absent from the country of their admittance temporarily are not included in the above restrictive dispositions.

Those citizens of the respective high contracting parties who are entitled to the special privileges of the present article and desire to make use of them should comply with the following conditions:

(a) Before leaving the country of their admittance they should apply for passports from the legation of their own nationality in the country of their admittance, stating that they are to leave with the intention of returning to the country from which they are to depart. Each passport of such character shall bear the photograph of the applicant with the seal of the said legation impressed on it and it shall be visaed by the ministry for foreign affairs of the country of their admittance.

(b) This kind of passports shall be valid for a period of two years from the date on which they are visaed.

#### ARTICLE 8

When the citizens of one of the high contracting parties who are other than laborers should desire to proceed to the territory of the other high contracting party from their native land or from a third country, they should provide themselves according to international usage with passports issued by the proper authorities of their native country or the foreign officials representing the interests of their native country at the port of embarkation or starting, and such passports shall be visaed by the diplomatic or consular authorities of the country to which they are to go at the same locality. If there are no such consular or diplomatic functionaries at the particular locality, the passports may be visaed by the diplomatic or consular authorities of the country to which they go at any port or city they may pass through en route to their object country.

#### ARTICLE 9

All the citizens of one high contracting party who are permitted to enter the national territory of the other high contracting party shall be subject in every respect to the immigration and sanitary laws in force, but they shall be treated in the same manner as the nationals of all the other friendly nations.

#### ARTICLE 10

Citizens of one high contracting party attempting to enter the national territory of the other high contracting party in contravention of the present agreement shall be denied admission.

#### ARTICLE 11

The wives and minor children of the Chinese citizens who are residing in Mexico at present and that of those who may be admitted to Mexico hereafter are not included in the restrictive dispositions.

#### ARTICLE 12

The Chinese agricultural colonists shall not be considered as immigrant laborers. The regulations governing the colonization of such agricultural colonists shall be decided upon by the mutual agreement of the two Governments on the same basis as it may be concluded between Mexico and the most-favored nations.

#### ARTICLE 13

The present agreement shall be written in English.

#### ARTICLE 14

All the above articles shall take effect on and from the day on which the notes, embodying the present agreement, shall be exchanged between the Secretary of Foreign Relations of the United States of Mexico and the Minister of the Republic of China accredited to Mexico.

Mr. HAYDEN. A former Secretary of State, Hon. Frank B. Kellogg, is responsible for securing the cooperation of the Mexi-

can Government in the enforcement by our own consuls of the immigration laws of the United States. Mr. Kellogg maintained that the State Department could adequately control the situation, which he proceeded to do. It was always his belief that to impose an immigration quota on Mexico was not only unnecessary but highly inadvisable. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] on last Friday read extracts from the testimony of Mr. Kellogg before the Senate Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, given on March 25, 1928. Let me read a few paragraphs in which the then Secretary of State stated his conclusions. I read, beginning on page 168 of the printed hearings, where Secretary Kellogg said:

To summarize, it is apparently proposed to enact legislation extending quota restrictions to a group of countries which are the closest neighbors of the United States even though there is no reason for such restrictions arising from the nature or volume of the immigration from those countries and despite the fact that the contemplated action would involve serious disadvantages to the United States in two important respects. In the first place, it is the opinion of the accredited representatives of the United States in the countries concerned as well as representative business men and others in a position to have first-hand knowledge of the situation that the measure contemplated would, if put into effect at this time, seriously injure the relations of the United States with the American countries and that it might even threaten Pan Americanism. Needless to say this phase of the question is of great national importance as far as the foreign policy of the United States is concerned. In the second place, the economic situation of the country is involved since an important part of the foreign investments and trade of the United States are in those countries and would be vitally affected by any disturbance of the good relations now obtaining.

As to Mexico, my statement deals with the international phases of the problem without attempting to discuss to any extent the domestic side. Suffice it to say that the question of the domestic necessity or advisability of limiting immigration from Mexico is at least highly debatable.

The statistics relating to the immigration from Mexico of aliens have already been given.

These figures showed that 250,860 Mexicans returned to Mexico from the United States during the three years 1924 to 1926, while only 192,985 natives of Mexico of all classes were admitted to the United States during the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1924, 1925, and 1926.

The improvement of our relations with Mexico is a source of considerable satisfaction to this Government and to the many American citizens and important commercial interests of this country in Mexico. The interests of the United States in Mexico are of such importance that no action prejudicial to their advantage should be undertaken without a most careful weighing of the possible consequences.

As has already been pointed out, the volume of American investments in Mexico is estimated at approximately \$1,125,000,000, while American trade with that country in 1927 amounted to \$137,815,044 imports and \$109,151,831 exports.

In support of the department's assertion that the legislation contemplated would be deeply resented by the Mexican people and give rise to severe criticism of this country, I may cite a dispatch just received from the ambassador to Mexico relative to an editorial in the Mexico City Excelsior of February 16, 1928. The Excelsior is one of the leading dailies in Mexico and is fairly representative of the conservative sentiment in that country. The editorial comments bitterly on the measures proposed in the United States to prevent further Mexican immigration to California and assails the United States generally for this attitude toward the Mexican laborer.

I am quite sure that Mexico would deeply resent being singled out, and I am quite sure that all South America and Central America would resent the application of the quota.

I have previously referred to the statement made by Hon. Joseph P. Cotton, the Undersecretary of State, at the hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on April 5, 1930. At that time Mr. Cotton filed the following statement with the committee:

#### MEXICAN IMMIGRATION

APRIL 2, 1930.

Immigration from Mexico is now so far restricted that the application of a quota to Mexico is not necessary and would not keep out any substantial number of Mexicans.

The monthly figures for immigration visas issued to Mexicans are as follows, with comparisons, for the previous year.

Then he gives the figures, which I ask to have included in the RECORD, and which I have previously submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Month	Fiscal year 1929-30	Fiscal year 1928-29
July	1,950	4,883
August	1,623	5,948
September	1,429	4,630
October	1,263	3,993
November	1,024	2,889
December	832	2,569
January	864	2,799
February	780	4,175
Total	9,765	31,886
Monthly average	1,221	3,986

Mr. HAYDEN. I quote further from Mr. Cotton's statement:

Immigration in earlier years was much greater.

Of the 9,765 immigration visas issued to Mexicans in the 8-month period, July, 1929, to February, 1930, inclusive, only 1,125, or 141 per month, were issued to common laborers without a previous residence in the United States. This type of immigration is therefore now entering the United States at a rate of less than 1,700 per annum.

No application of the quota would reduce these figures substantially.

Mr. Cotton spoke in behalf of the present Secretary of State, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, who is now in attendance at the Conference for the Limitation of Naval Armaments in London. I have talked to Mr. Stimson relative to this matter, and I know that the Secretary of State has exactly the same attitude as had his predecessor, Mr. Kellogg. He believes, as did Mr. Kellogg, that it would be a great mistake for the Congress of the United States to enact a law imposing a rigid immigration quota upon Mexico.

I am sure that the Secretary of State was fully aware before he departed for England of the activities of our American consuls in Mexico in refusing visas to Mexican citizens who could not comply with the immigration laws of the United States, and that the good work done by them in Mexico met with his hearty approval.

The chief of the visa office of the State Department, Mr. John Farr Simmons, delivered an address at a conference on immigration held at Williamstown, Mass., last summer which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] appreciated so highly that he had it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 4, 1929. After reading this address the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has always been an ardent advocate of immigration restriction, stated publicly that he was convinced that it was no longer necessary for Congress to enact legislation imposing a quota on Mexico. I will quote briefly from the address delivered by Mr. Simmons at the Williamstown Institute of Politics, on August 7, 1929:

Reports requested from American diplomatic representatives in Latin American countries are practically unanimous in their statement that the application of quota restrictions to them could not fail to be interpreted by them as a radical departure from the traditional policy of this country toward Latin America, and as evidence of unwillingness to continue to regard them as equals and neighbors having common problems, interests, and aims.

In questioning the wisdom of adopting legislation to that end at the present time, I wish to make it clear that there is no advocacy of the free admission of large numbers of aliens of any nationality to the injury of the best interests of the United States. It would seem logical, however, that before any particular measure having serious disadvantages is adopted, full information should be available as to the nature and extent of the problem which it is designed to correct; careful consideration should be given to whether the proposed legislation would effect the desired result if passed, and an endeavor should be made to find, if possible, other means of attaining the same object which would involve less injury to legitimate interests of the United States.

Mr. Simmons further said:

It appears that the condition described has not been due to any deliberate failure on the part of consular officers in Mexico to give full effect to the law, but rather to an entirely different conception of what the law required. This seems to have been brought about by the nature and volume of immigration from that country. The requirements on the Mexican border were apparently relaxed somewhat during the war, when labor was badly needed. Without doubt Mexican labor was also needed in the border States in the postwar period, and everything possible appears to have been done to facilitate its entry. Accordingly precedents were established by immigration officers, and later followed by consular officers, in discharging their new responsibilities under the immigration act of 1924, which led to the recent apparent divergence in the stand-

ards applied in Mexico and those observed elsewhere. The method of dealing with Mexican immigration, however, was a matter of natural development influenced by conditions on both sides of the border.

As soon as it was definitely ascertained that the practice in Mexico was below the standard of the service, immediate steps were taken to rectify the situation. Appropriate instructions were issued in August, 1928, to the supervising consul general at Mexico City and energetic measures were taken to effect the result desired. Consular officers in Mexico were urged in particular to refuse immigration visas to Mexicans who could not definitely establish their admissibility under the restrictive clauses concerning illiteracy, contract labor, and likelihood to become public charges.

If the surreptitious entry of Mexicans on a large scale should be stopped by adequate measures, it is believed that the volume of immigration from Mexico can and will be reduced by a proper enforcement of existing law to proportions that will not represent any danger to this country. The results obtained as a result of the instructions to the consul general in Mexico City and of a conference of consular officers held in February in Mexico City will best be reflected in the statistics of immigration visas issued to natives of Mexico during recent months.

Mr. President, I said at the beginning of my remarks that if Mexican quota legislation shall be enacted by Congress President Hoover will be faced with the problem of signing or vetoing it. There are many people in the United States who believe that such legislation is necessary, and his failure to sign such a bill would be bitterly disappointing to them.

Much has been written in our American magazines in favor of the restriction of Mexican immigration by the application of a quota. One of the most forceful and convincing articles which I have read on the subject appeared in the February 8 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "The Mexicanization of American Business," by Roy L. Garis, professor of economics of Vanderbilt University. Mr. Garis begins his article with the following paragraph:

In his acceptance speech Mr. Hoover linked the policy of restriction of immigration with the protective tariff as essential components of the Republican Party program to protect our people "from competition with the lowest standards of living abroad."

In his message to Congress at the beginning of the second session of the Seventy-first Congress, last December, the President said:

Restriction of immigration has from every aspect proved a sound national policy. Our pressing problem is to formulate a method by which the limited number of immigrants whom we do welcome shall be adapted to our national setting and our national needs.

Statements of that character naturally lead those who are ardent restrictionists to believe that the President of the United States is in full accord with their views, and it is only reasonable for them to expect that if a Mexican quota bill were sent to him by the Congress for approval he would sign it. In doing so the President would be faced with the other horn of the dilemma. He would be compelled to consider the probability of giving offense to friendly peoples of other nations with whom he established close and cordial contact by a tour which he made through Central and South America just prior to his inauguration as President of the United States.

I hold in my hand a compilation of the addresses delivered during the visit of Herbert Hoover, President elect of the United States, to Central and South America in November and December, 1928. The President elect stopped at a number of points in Latin America, where he was greeted by the officials of various governments.

One of the first stops was at Amapala, in the Republic of Honduras, on November 26, 1928. At that time Mr. Hoover said:

I come to pay a call of friendship. In a sense I represent on this occasion the people of the United States extending a friendly greeting to our fellow democracies on the American Continent. I would wish to symbolize the friendly visit of one good neighbor to another. In our daily life good neighbors call upon each other as the evidence of solicitude for the common welfare and to learn of the circumstances and point of view of each, so that there may come both understanding and respect, which are the cementing forces of all enduring society. This should be equally true amongst nations. We have a desire to maintain not only the cordial relations of governments with each other, but the relations of good neighbors. Through greater understanding that comes with more contact we may build up that common respect and service which is the only enduring basis of international friendship.

Again, on the same day, in response to an address by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of El Salvador, Mr. Hoover said:

Economic development does not and should not be the sole basis of exchange between nations but rather the incident of it. We have



the mutual problems of strengthening the foundations of peace, building up confidence and friendship, and the institutions and ideals of each of our nations.

The most precious possession of each of us is our love of country, of race, our traditions, and our institutions. We have in this hemisphere a parallel of struggle for independence, in conflict with nature, in the creation of institutions of freedom and liberty which in themselves are an imperishable bond.

At Guayaquil, on December 1, the President elect said:

I would that I could find the appropriate words to express the esteem and the good will toward all our sister republics which I know lie in the hearts of the people of the United States. Democracy is more than a form of political organization; it is a human faith. True democracy is not and can not be imperialistic. The brotherhood of this faith is the guaranty of good will. It is the guaranty of respect which comes only from equals in a common struggle to upbuild human welfare.

If the people of South America are discriminated against, as is proposed in the bill now pending before the Senate—which imposes no quota upon Canada or Newfoundland, but does fix a limit, and a very strict limit, upon the number of persons who may enter the United States from all the countries south of the Rio Grande—can they be blamed for feeling, and feeling very keenly, that the Government of the United States is discriminating against them on account of their race, that we do not consider them our equals, as the President elect made plain he did?

Mr. Hoover proceeded down the west coast of South America to Chile. At the government palace in Santiago on December 11, 1928, he said:

And I should be derelict did I not emphasize to you and the people of Chile the admiration which I and the American people hold for the economic and cultural advancement which your nation has contributed to the Western Hemisphere. We are all struggling to a common aim; we not only learn from each other but we receive inspiration from the heroism, leadership, and accomplishments of sister republics.

At Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, on December 14, the President elect said:

I believe not alone that the fundamental forces in the world are making for progress, but that the world to-day, and particularly the western world, stands upon the threshold of a new era of advancement. Never before has the outlook been brighter for the march of peace, for economic progress, for the growth of ordered liberty and of liberal institutions, for opportunity of achievement among men, and the growth of those things which dignify and ennoble life.

At Montevideo, in response to an address delivered by the President of Uruguay, Mr. Hoover said:

Your excellency, I sometimes think that relations between nations bear the humble comparison of the relations between neighbors in our busy private lives. Crowded with domestic problems, we really know but little of our neighbors; we read in the press of sensational accidents; we know the gossip of unworthy members of their families; we read descriptions of their homes. But we know little of the finer qualities of their home life; their deep affections; their sorrows; their self-denials; their courage and their idealisms. So it is with nations. Their national accomplishments, the "flower" of thought and the great intangibles of national character and ideals, can come only with contact. From these contacts come that respect and friendship, that desire for helpfulness, which must be the true basis of international relations.

I shall end these quotations with a part of the address delivered by Mr. Hoover before the Brazilian Congress in Rio de Janeiro December 22, 1928, in which he said:

I wish to thank you for your expressions of welcome and your expressions of friendship to my country. Our countries have throughout their history an unbroken record not only of peace but a record of mutual good will and helpfulness which has become a precious tradition between us. I wish again to repeat my gratitude for the honor which you have paid to my country.

I have read these extracts from the speeches delivered by Mr. Hoover in Central and South America for the purpose of showing that he fully appreciates the necessity for taking into consideration the sentiments and the feelings of the people who reside in the countries south of the Rio Grande. No one who has ever traveled in Latin America will report otherwise than that they are a proud and a high-spirited people. They value above money, above any material consideration, the good will and the respect of others. There is no quicker way in which all of the benefits which were brought about by the long journey made by the President elect of the United States could be utterly destroyed than by the enactment of the bill now pending before the Senate.

I hope that the President of the United States will not be faced with this dilemma. I am sure that the President will not be if he will but let the country know that he, as the Chief Executive of the United States, now has the power in his own hands so to limit the number of immigrants coming into this country that there will be no further complaint from the American people that large numbers of undesirable aliens are being admitted. The President should let everyone know that this wholly desirable result can be accomplished not by discriminating against one or more of our neighbors among the nations of the Western Hemisphere but by treating them all exactly alike and in the same manner as we treat the greatest and most powerful nations of Europe.

Mexico is our neighbor. We have a common boundary extending from the mouth of the Rio Grande and thence across the continent to San Diego, a distance of over 1,800 miles. Mexico is there, has been there all the years, and will continue in close proximity to the United States. We must of necessity, by reason of propinquity if nothing else, adopt a different attitude toward our closest neighbor than we do toward people who live at a greater distance. Our contacts are so close and so intimate that we must be most cautious in the enactment of legislation which might be highly offensive to a very close and, in a business way, a very valuable neighbor. Congress should exercise greater care and consideration than we would with respect to some country located in some far-off corner of the world with whom our relations are much less familiar.

The relationship between the two countries is well illustrated by a telegram that I recently received, which I ask to have read from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

NOGALES, ARIZ., March 14, 1930.

Senator CARL HAYDEN,

Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Chamber of Commerce of Nogales, Ariz., in regular session, respectfully protests on behalf of evident discrimination against our Mexican neighbors in the proposed quota in immigration bills now pending. We request that Canada and Mexico, as our sister nations, be placed on equal quotas. This protest is made in the interest of continental comity and solidarity.

NOGALES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
G. R. MICHAELIS, Secretary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, for many generations people in both Mexico and the United States have been accepting the international border as a street which they could cross at will, thus promoting commercial and social intercourse. It made for a feeling of friendliness between the people.

As an illustration of these constant crossings at places like Nogales, where the city in Arizona and the city in Mexico are separated only by the width of a street, I read from the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1928, on page 10, under the heading of "Immigration from Mexico":

Hundreds of thousands of aliens and citizens residing on either side of the boundary, mainly in towns contiguous thereto, cross and recross daily or periodically upon social or business errands. Treating each entry of these "crossers" as a separate transaction, and adding thereto all other transactions, the total volume of entrants is estimated to have been approximately 27,000,000 for the past year. As on the Canadian border, the examinations of these regular "crossers" is greatly facilitated by the use of identification cards.

Twenty-seven million crossings annually on the Mexican border, as estimated by the Commissioner General of Immigration! Certainly that figure demonstrates the intimacy of the contacts between the two countries.

For some years Mexico and the Mexican people had more or less suspicion of the United States and its intentions as to the annexation of territory. President Wilson recognized this feeling when he made his Mobile speech, early in his first administration, disclaiming on the part of the United States any desire for Mexican territory. That was the incident in more recent years that first began to dispel the fears which the Latin people had long entertained secretly.

That remarkable speech, delivered by Mr. Wilson on the 27th of October, 1913, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 3 at the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. President Wilson said:

I want to take this occasion to say that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest. She will devote herself to showing that she knows how to make honorable and fruitful use of the territory she has, and she must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarters are material interests

made superior to human liberty and national opportunity. I say this, not with a single thought that anyone will gainsay it, but merely to fix in our consciousness what our real relationship with the rest of America is. It is the relationship of a family of mankind devoted to the development of true constitutional liberty. We know that that is the soil out of which the best enterprise springs. We know that this is a cause which we are making in common with our neighbors, because we have had to make it for ourselves.

A similar sentiment was more recently expressed by the present President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, in his inaugural address on March 4, 1929, when he said:

Those who have a true understanding of America know that we have no desire for territorial expansion, for economic or other domination of other peoples. Such purposes are repugnant to our ideals of human freedom. Our form of government is ill adapted to the responsibilities which inevitably follow permanent limitation of the independence of other peoples. Superficial observers seem to find no destiny for our abounding increase in population, in wealth and power except that of imperialism. They fail to see that the American people are engrossed in the building for themselves of a new economic system, a new social system, a new political system—all of which are characterized by aspirations of freedom of opportunity and thereby are the negation of imperialism.

Such statements made by such high authority are, of course, reassuring to the country which in times past has suffered from annexation of territory by the United States.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to call for a quorum?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina. Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Frazier	Kean	Simmons
Ashurst	George	Kendrick	Smoot
Barkley	Gillett	Keyes	Steiwer
Bingham	Glass	McKellar	Stephens
Black	Glenn	McNary	Sullivan
Blaine	Goff	Metcalf	Swanson
Blease	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Gould	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Greene	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Overman	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Patterson	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Heflin	Robison, Ky.	Watson
Deneen	Howell	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Johnson	Shipstead	
Fess	Jones	Shorridge	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, just prior to the quorum call I directed the attention of the Senate to a statement contained in a speech delivered by President Wilson at Mobile in 1913, in which he disclaimed any desire on the part of the United States for annexation of territory by conquest, and to the reassurance in that regard contained in the inaugural address of President Hoover.

The administration of Dwight Morrow as ambassador to Mexico did much to further dispel a popular belief in Mexico of American unfriendliness. His efforts and counsel with officials of the Mexican Government in aiding the solution of some of their own governmental problems caused a radical change in the Mexican popular belief. Instead of an ulterior motive on the part of the Government to the north, Mexicans found our Government and its representatives willing to help in every direction, governmental or social.

A reliable statement is that the Mexican people regret that Mr. Morrow is to leave Mexico. As a result of his fine service as ambassador from the United States, they feel that he has made it known in many ways that a mistaken idea had obtained for decades in that country as to what the United States really thought of Mexico and her people.

I am sure that it would be of interest to the Senate to have me read a brief extract from an article by James H. Batten, entitled "Mexico's Program: An Opportunity," which appeared in the World Tomorrow for January, 1929. He said:

While Mexico is placing tremendous emphasis nationally upon educational measures, it is significant that she is also placing an equal emphasis upon good will internationally. Much of the ill will which has been manifest in past decades between Mexico and the United States has been due to what the Spanish call *palabra*. It is difficult to translate the exact significance of this word into English, but in substance it means "the right to talk." Too many Americans with only a superficial knowledge of the facts concerning Mexico have indulged "the

right to talk." \* \* \* Diplomats who believe that "in the conduct of foreign relations idealism is a dangerous element, and that morals and expediency are nearly always identical," have contributed largely in the past to the generation of a spirit of distrust between the two nations.

Perhaps the most popular American in Mexico is a diplomat of a very different type, Hon. Dwight W. Morrow, a man who believes in human relations, and whose sympathetic understanding and tact quickly placed diplomacy between the two countries on a cordial plane. With the able assistance of Hon. J. Reuben Clark, now Undersecretary of State, Mr. Morrow was able to reach an adjustment equitable to all concerned of the disputed oil and land questions which had threatened to embroil the two nations in conflict.

I might add in this connection that one who afterwards became Mr. Morrow's son-in-law, Colonel Lindbergh, performed a wonderful service to both Mexico and the United States in the airplane flight he made to the City of Mexico. He did more by that one act to promote good will between the two countries than anything that has happened for many, many years. The spectacular flight of Colonel Lindbergh attracted the attention of the people of both countries and made them realize how closely they are drawn together. We are nearer neighbors today by reason of aviation than we ever were before, and, being closer together, we must be more careful and considerate in our relations with one another.

All the good work of these recent years would be placed in jeopardy by the announcement of the doctrine that the friendly nation of the north has belied its attitude and is so distrustful of the Government of Mexico that rigid bars are to be erected, not by mutual agreement but by American law, to deny the right to come and go that has obtained for many generations. When that is done it will require many years to again establish the confidence of Mexico and her thinking people in the United States.

Mexico is one of the greatest buyers of American goods of all the Latin American group. For many years this trade went to Europe, partly because the United States did not appeal as did some of the European countries. The lack of appeal was due to many causes, but they have been largely swept aside, and this, as well as the World War, served to give Mexico confidence in American business. This confidence would be lost, of course, if a drastic immigration policy were adopted contrary to the wishes of the people of Mexico and as an affront to their pride.

The attention of the Senate is invited to a table which appears in the 1929 edition of the Yearbook of the Department of Commerce. I ask that the table may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The table is as follows:

Trade (general) with principal countries  
(Value in thousands of dollars; includes gold and silver bullion and specie)

Country of origin or destination	Imports				Exports			
	1913	1926	1927	1928	1913	1926	1927	1928
Total.....	94,050	184,188	163,495	83,171	146,928	334,186	296,173	150,694
United States.....	47,610	129,771	109,901	56,723	113,487	237,248	196,237	105,102
Canada.....	143	2,695	2,261	1,032	728	887	408	378
Cuba.....	90	40	28	14	845	6,784	4,968	1,699
Argentina.....	598	916	193	46	8	4,043	1,424	958
Brazil.....	5	13	12	3	12	2,280	2,225	1,161
Belgium.....	1,373	1,295	2,723	1,466	2,519	14,926	13,918	6,890
Czechoslovakia.....		800	709	331		(1)	(1)	(1)
France.....	8,970	8,504	8,074	3,750	3,498	7,546	8,765	4,844
Germany.....	12,333	13,563	13,916	7,127	8,041	15,197	29,554	9,465
Netherlands.....	327	891	661	544	65	6,110	3,359	1,219
Spain.....	3,443	3,712	2,757	1,620	1,068	825	1,752	943
United Kingdom.....	12,652	13,645	10,632	6,339	15,234	23,884	22,920	12,254
Switzerland.....	925	1,633	1,452	925	2	3	3	3
All other countries.....	5,576	6,710	10,176	3,251	1,421	14,452	10,629	5,778
Per cent of total:								
United States.....	50.6	70.5	67.2	68.2	77.2	71.0	66.3	69.7
France.....	9.5	4.6	4.9	4.5	2.4	2.3	3.0	3.2
Germany.....	13.1	7.4	8.5	8.6	5.5	4.5	10.0	6.3
United Kingdom.....	13.5	7.4	6.5	7.6	10.4	7.1	7.7	8.1

<sup>1</sup> January-June.

<sup>2</sup> Less than \$500.

Mr. HAYDEN. The table shows that the imports into Mexico from the United States amounted to 68.2 per cent of the total imports into that country and that the exports from Mexico to the United States amounted to practically 70 per cent of the total exports from that country. It may also be stated that the exports to and imports from Mexico constituted over 3 per cent of the total foreign trade of the United States.

It is believed that before any particular measure which would affect adversely the very important interests of this country and Mexico is enacted, full information should be available as to the



nature and extent of the problem which it is designed to correct. Careful consideration should be given to whether the proposed legislation would affect the desired result if passed, and an endeavor should be made to find, if possible, other means of attaining the same object which would involve less injury to legitimate interests of the United States.

I am not the only one who has been convinced by these undisputed facts as presented by the State Department that the number of Mexicans lawfully admitted to the United States has been reduced to such an extent that the influx of undesirable aliens from that source has been practically eliminated.

There has been no more able, no more conscientious, and no more influential advocate of an immigration quota for Mexico than Prof. Paul S. Taylor, of the University of California. Every Senator has received a copy of his study of Mexican labor in the South Platte Valley in Colorado, published by the university. This study, which was made under supervision of the faculty of that great institution of learning and his investigation on Mexican labor in the Imperial Valley, Calif., have become classics among immigration restrictionists.

Mr. Hushing, of the American Federation of Labor, made a digest of the report on the Platte Valley investigation for President Green, which was so highly appreciated by the House Committee on Immigration that it was included in and makes up the last four pages of the majority report on the Johnson bill, H. R. 10343.

Two distinguished members of the House Committee on Immigration, Hon. JOHN C. BOX and Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, requested Prof. Roy L. Garis, of Vanderbilt University, to make a study of Mexican immigration for them. In the report printed as a part of the House hearings, Congressman BOX and Congressman JENKINS make this statement:

As a part of this survey, we requested Dr. Roy L. Garis, professor of economics at Vanderbilt University, one of the most learned and able students of the immigration problem, to make a special investigation of the subject and report upon it. Doctor Garis's report will be submitted for printing and will be found to contain much pointed and valuable matter bearing on the issues herein discussed and upon the whole problem. The special attention of the committee and of students of this question is called to Doctor Garis's report.

I have here a copy of that report which I have read over very carefully. Copies of it, I believe, have been sent to all Senators. In the report Professor Garis favorably and approvingly quotes Dr. Paul S. Taylor more than a dozen times.

Professor Taylor is a restrictionist of undisputed standing, a careful student, who until very recently has been a most ardent advocate of imposing a quota on Mexico. But he is intellectually honest, and when he learned of the facts, which I have given to the Senate, he did not hesitate to change his mind.

In the April number of the Survey Graphic, recently published, is an article entitled "More Bars Against Mexico," by Paul S. Taylor. With the indulgence of the Senate I wish to read a short extract from that article, as follows:

Another proposal is to restrict with no quota legislation at all, but simply by full enforcement of existing laws. Indeed, this is not so much a proposal as the statement of an existing condition. Progressively stricter enforcement of present immigration laws has already cut the influx of Mexicans to one-third its previous volume. This is the most important factor in the present situation.

Then again:

The State Department has admitted inadvertent laxity in the past—until 1929 its consuls in Mexico maintained lower standards for granting visas than are required by law, and are maintained in the Eastern Hemisphere. Awakened to the situation by the imminence of restrictive legislation, it is now establishing rigorous enforcement in the Western Hemisphere, uniform with that maintained elsewhere. By insistence on the production of all documents required by law, by more rigid administration of the clauses barring persons who are liable to become public charges, who are alien-contract laborers, illiterate or defective, the number of immigration visas granted to Mexican laborers is now greatly reduced. Do not write restrictions into the statutes, for under existing laws properly enforced, the consuls debar that class of immigrants against whom the cry for restriction is raised. The State Department has not expressed its official position recently, but the above appears to be a reasonable interpretation of its activities and attitude.

I might add that the State Department has now fully expressed its official opinion, and I have placed in the RECORD today its most recent showing against the enactment of the legislation here proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

I continue reading from the article by Professor Taylor:

Many, perhaps most, Mexican officials do not wish unlimited emigration of their nationals, yet they dislike restriction by statute. No protest has been made by the Mexican Government against the work of the consular officers and none is likely.

I invite the particular attention of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] to that statement, which is a further answer to the question which he addressed to me. I continue reading:

And the farmers of the Southwest? They have protested restriction, and urged that if it comes they should have sufficient notification to permit readjustment. Should not some one tell them that restriction is here, and that unless the now adamant State Department softens, restriction is here to stay? That if the State Department fails to restrict, the cry for the quota, now muffled, will become irresistible? Should they not be told to begin readjustment now? Practical politics are changing the issue at Washington from "Shall we restrict?" to "How shall we continue to restrict?"

In the same magazine is an article entitled "Tightening the Mexican Border," by Robert M. McLean, which was recently published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of the able Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL]. I read from the writings of Mr. McLean:

But while the felony law has almost halted illegal entries, the United States Consular Service has also been doing its part to plug the gaps in the border. There has been a decided tightening up in the matter of visas. Formerly, few questions were asked. It was assumed that even if Uncle Sam did not have "land enough to give us all a farm" he at least had land enough to give every Mexican cotton picker or beet worker a paying job that would keep him from becoming a public charge. Now the consular agents in Mexico are not so sure. As a matter of fact, they have things pretty much in their own hands.

Comes Juan Garcia, ragged, shabby, destination Texas. Has he any assurance of work when he crosses the line? No. There is a probability, as they see it, that he will become a public charge. Visa denied.

Enter José Lopez, same general appearance, same destination, same general questions. Sure he has a job, and he proudly displays a letter from his brother's employer, promising him work. Contract laborer! Visa denied. Anyway, the Consular Service has private information at that particular moment that there is plenty of Mexican labor in that particular part of Texas. Queer how long it has taken us, while Mr. BOX and Mr. HARRIS have been clamoring for a quota, to find out what could be done in other ways.

Prof. Roy L. Garis, whom I have previously mentioned, is an able and conscientious investigator. I have read his report to Congressmen BOX and JENKINS and have no fault to find with it except that he seems loath to acknowledge this constructive achievement of the State Department.

On page 615 of the hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, which contains the report of Professor Garis, I find this statement:

It is true that the State Department is seeking to ward off the numerical restriction of Mexican immigration by a more drastic enforcement of the present "quality" tests in the immigration law which apply to all immigrants, whether they come from quota or nonquota countries. Thus a more drastic enforcement of the literacy test and of the proper issuing of visas is having some effect. Likewise the State Department is being aided by the enactment into law by a recent session of Congress of the provision making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States under certain conditions in violation of law. The fear of going to jail is having some effect in deterring the Mexican from entering this country illegally, whereas before he was merely subject to deportation without penalty each time he was caught after entering illegally.

That statement indicates that Professor Garis had evidently heard something about the good work done by the American consuls in Mexico, but he either did not obtain all the facts or his mind failed to grasp their significance. Proof of this is found in the entire absence of any mention of the activities of the State Department in an article published in the Saturday Evening Post of February 8, 1930, which I have previously mentioned. The article, entitled "The Mexicanization of American Business," is based almost entirely upon the report made by Professor Garis to Representative BOX and Representative JENKINS. The information contained in the report was condensed, but it was not brought down to date. Let me suggest that President Hoover should ask his good friend Cyrus C. K. Curtis to detail some one else to write the real story of what has been accomplished in respect to restriction of immigration from Mexico. The wide publicity which has been given by the Saturday Evening Post through articles advocating the imposition of a numerical quota upon Mexico would in justice require that this be done.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that I have no fault to find with any statement made by Professor Taylor, of the University of California, in his various reports, or by Professor Garis, of Vanderbilt University, or of any of the other well educated, well trained, careful investigators who have looked into the Mexican immigration situation. If the Mexicans were to continue to

come into the United States in unlimited numbers, as they have in past years, and if there were no way of preventing their entering the United States except by the enactment of a quota law, of course I would vote for it, and every Representative and every Senator should support such legislation. But, as I have demonstrated to the Senate, if every result that could be accomplished by the enactment of a quota law has already been accomplished by our consuls in Mexico through the visa provision of existing law and they have actually reduced the number until it is equivalent to a quota, then the enactment of such legislation is no longer necessary.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator has stated it, I am sure, but I have been out of the Chamber a couple of times during the course of his remarks, and I should like to inquire as to the attitude of the State Department regarding this proposed legislation.

Mr. HAYDEN. The State Department has gone on record repeatedly against the enactment of legislation imposing an immigration quota on Mexico and the other countries of Latin America. When that subject was under active consideration two years ago Secretary Kellogg appeared in person before the committees of Congress in opposition to it and then advised that an earnest effort would be made to handle the situation under existing law. A year ago in February, at his instance, a conference of American consuls was called in the City of Mexico; they were given instructions to enforce the law relating to the visa of passports with the same rigor in that country as in Europe. The result of that effort is as I have stated in detail to-day.

Mr. DILL. I knew that some time ago they were opposed to a quota basis, but I thought possibly their attitude had changed.

Mr. HAYDEN. There has been no change in the attitude of the Department of State. Upon the other hand, the department now claims that its previous opposition to the enactment of such legislation has been fully justified by the magnificent results which the American consuls have accomplished during the past nine months.

Mr. DILL. And what is the attitude of the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of Labor has heretofore favored the enactment of a quota law for the Western Hemisphere but not as strict a law for our neighbor nations as for European countries. In his annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, the Secretary of Labor expresses his views upon that question:

In a previous report I expressed the opinion that the whole problem of immigration from New World countries could be satisfactorily solved by extending a modified quota system to countries of the natives of which are now free to come to the United States in unlimited numbers. I suggested that more liberal quotas and an increased minimum quota be allotted to New World countries than in the case of others and pointed out that such action could not well be objected to as discriminatory in view of the fact that we already accord the privilege of open immigration to our neighbors of North, Central, and South America and at the same time impose quota restrictions on other countries. To my mind the modified quota system I have suggested would be less discriminatory than the present one.

That, in practical effect, would amount to an indorsement by Secretary Davis of the bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the Representative from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], which does grant more liberal quotas to countries of the Western Hemisphere than does the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], which imposes the same quota upon the countries of the Western Hemisphere as is applied to European countries.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield further to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The trouble with that bill is that it bases the quota upon the number of our people who go to those countries, multiplied by four, which seems to me is a most peculiar basis, to say the least, for determining the number of people who may come into this country.

Mr. HAYDEN. Be that as it may, it does comply with the suggestion made by the Secretary of Labor that the law should be more liberal as to countries of the Western Hemisphere than the strict enforcement of the 2 per cent rule now applied to immigrants from Europe.

Mr. DILL. That is true, but it uses a different basis. It uses the number of people who go from this country into those countries, while the basis used in the case of European countries is the number of people in this country of their blood.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is the Senator from Washington referring to the Johnson bill?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. My understanding of that bill—I may be mistaken—is that the number is based on the visas issued by consuls in those countries to people coming from those countries to the United States, in order that—

Mr. DILL. That was not my understanding, as I read it.

Mr. BINGHAM. In order that the same number of people might be permitted to come in now that came in in 1928.

Mr. DILL. My understanding is—I have not a copy of the bill before me, but I read it just a few days ago—that the basis proposed is the number of people who go from this country into those countries multiplied by four, in order to give a liberal quota.

Mr. HAYDEN. The statement of the Senator from Washington is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. GOULD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator from Washington is accurate in his statement. I think that the Senator from Connecticut has confused a provision in the latter part of the bill with an earlier provision. In the first instance, the bill of Representative JOHNSON seeks to make the number of Mexicans who will be permitted to come into this country dependent upon the number of Americans who have gone to Mexico, multiplied by 4, in order to give a number that he thinks can not be caviled at or criticised in relation to Mexican immigration. Then he seeks in the latter portion of the bill to give a bonus, as he terms it, of an extra number for 1930 and 1931, so that there may be a period of adjustment for those who say they immediately require Mexican labor, and the basis, as I understand, of such "bonus" is that he gives one-half in 1930 of those who received visas in the last six months, and in 1931 one-half of that one-half.

Mr. BINGHAM. But, Mr. President, with the exception—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. With the exception of Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, and Cuba, on page 2 the Johnson bill provides:

And, in the case of each of the other countries, the number of immigration visas issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, to immigrants born in such country.

Mr. DILL. That is where the Senator got the idea he has expressed.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. GOULD. Mr. President, there has been considerable agitation regarding this immigration question. Since I have been in the Senate during the last four years there have been a number of bills introduced, but they never have gotten beyond the Senate. I believe that the bill which I hold in my hand, and which is the last copy of the so-called Johnson bill as reported by the House committee, and which seems to be perfectly satisfactory to the Members of the other body, would be desirable as an amendment to the pending bill.

If agreeable to the Senator from Arizona, I think this is a good time to offer it as an amendment. I think it will accomplish what the Senator from Arizona is advocating so earnestly, and if I may be permitted to do so at this time, I will offer it as a substitute for the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] now pending. If adopted, it would be a step toward securing some legislation on this subject at this session of Congress. The so-called Johnson bill, which I desire to offer as an amendment, would restrict the number of Mexicans coming in, and in that respect it ought to be satisfactory to those who want restriction, and it ought likewise to be satisfactory to those who desire to let some seasonal labor come in from Mexico. The Johnson bill, if adopted as an amendment, would impose a quota also on the other countries of the Western Hemisphere in such manner that it would seem to me it ought to be quite satisfactory.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the inconsistency of this quota proposition. It is argued here that we are discriminating against Canada if we leave out Canada, but here it is proposed to pick out four countries on the western continent and grant them one quota basis and then to



pick out the other countries on the Western Hemisphere and give them another quota basis. Therefore the proposed immigration law would not only discriminate, but there would be a special kind of discrimination. We would say to the European countries, "We will take a percentage of native-born citizens who are descended from the people who have come from those countries"; to Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, and Cuba we would say, "We will multiply the number who have gone into those countries from the United States by 4"; and the other countries on the Western Hemisphere we would say that the number shall be determined by the visas which have been granted. So there is nothing but discrimination under the proposal of the Senator from Maine. It is four times worse, in my judgment, from the discriminatory standpoint, than is the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the printing of the Johnson bill, as suggested by the Senator from Maine, at the conclusion of my remarks.

To return to the point which I was discussing, I cited the Johnson bill as an instance of a more liberal quota proposal with respect to the countries of the Western Hemisphere such as is recommended by the Secretary of Labor in his last annual report, where he gives reasons why it would not be a discrimination against the remainder of the world to grant larger quotas to immigrants from the countries of the Western Hemisphere which are now on a nonquota basis. That might be accomplished, for example, by providing that the 150,000 immigrants who may come into the United States under the national-origins clause of the immigration act shall be apportioned among those countries to which that law now applies. Another total number might be fixed for the Western Hemisphere, to be divided among the countries on a percentage basis. I am not saying just how such a plan should be carried out, but evidently the Secretary of Labor had in mind a different and a preferential treatment of the countries on this hemisphere than those of the remainder of the world.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENDRICK. The Senator speaks of the House bill as being more liberal in its provisions than the Senate bill. I wonder if the Senator would be favorable to a liberalization along the line of giving us seasonal labor in connection with an immigration bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. That presents a very interesting and a very serious problem, one which has been met in European countries by agreements between governments.

Mr. KENDRICK. I mean, if the Senator will permit me, for agricultural purposes only.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator would limit seasonal immigration to agricultural laborers only he would follow a precedent established during the World War when the then Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wilson, permitted the immigration of otherwise inadmissible aliens under a permit system whereby they were given identification papers. Such aliens were to seek employment only in agricultural pursuits, and the employer was required, when their services were no longer needed, to see that they returned to Mexico.

I realize that such a plan presents certain complications that some people seem to fear would make it difficult of administration; but there was no serious difficulty of that kind during the World War. The great majority of the agricultural laborers who were admitted into the United States did return to Mexico. There was, however, a very large percentage of desertions among railroad laborers admitted and scattered far into the interior of the country.

I am quite sure that the seasonal movement of laborers is much easier of administration in States not far from the border, where the Mexicans have been accustomed to come and go. There would not be nearly as much difficulty in that regard as where laborers are transported far into the interior where they would be brought into regions where there is a much higher scale of wages paid to laborers in industry, and where the inclination to desert is therefore very much greater.

Mr. KENDRICK. Does the Senator believe that the increased number of the quota, as fixed in the House bill, would take care of the needs of seasonal labor for agriculture?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the fact that the quota of 2,900 would not be recognized by the sponsor of the bill, Mr. Johnson of Washington, who, as has been stated here, provides in his bill for 11,121 next year, and then reduce the number to 6,961 the following year, and then finally at the end of the third year brings the final quota down to 2,900. That is evidence on the face of the Johnson bill that there is need for readjustment.

Another way of accomplishing a readjustment would be to fix an arbitrary quota in the very beginning, but to allow an opportunity for seasonal agricultural laborers to enter the United States when American laborers can not be found to do the work. All such aliens to be admitted for a strictly limited time with provisions to insure their return to Canada or Mexico as the case may be.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would not the Senator allow an adjustment as well for seasonal workers upon the poor railroads whose bonds and stocks are owned by our widows and orphans?

Mr. HAYDEN. The great difficulty in that regard is that the kind of labor that is gathered up in Mexico for work as section hands and transported to the United States is vastly different from a farm worker. Like manufacturing, track work goes on normally all the year around. Section hands are required every month in the year. It is not a seasonal problem.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the Senator is aware that the railroads insist that they require the labor quite as much as our farmers insist it. The Senator is aware of that, is he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard that statement before. I am also aware that the railroads of the United States, generally, are in a much more prosperous condition than the farmers of our country. If it is only a question of paying a living wage to an American to do the work of a section hand, I think the railroads probably have the money to do it, whereas many farmers may not be able to maintain a laborer for the entire year when his services are needed for only part of it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I rather reached the other conclusion, that the railroads were even less prosperous than the farmers. They require, as the Senator knows, such a striking return upon their investment in order to prevent the activities of a municipality or a State or the Government from being confiscatory; and I imagined that they were really in a worse state than our farmers are.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KENDRICK. In answer to the Senator from California, I think it may be very definitely shown that there is this distinction between the seasonal laborer for agriculture and the seasonal laborer for any form of industry: That is, that the people of our own country will very gladly and willingly do any kind of industrial labor, provided only they are paid a sufficient wage for it; whereas in the case of agricultural labor it is a fact that can not be denied that there is a great deal of that labor that our own people will not do. They do not care to do it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that I think he is doubtless correct in that assertion; but I remember, when the restrictive immigration law was passed, that the great steel mills of the East and some of the other great industries of the East argued to us just as forcefully and almost as tearfully as some of the people from the State from which I come argue to-day that it was an utter impossibility for them to exist prosperously, or adequately to maintain their industries, if we did not permit the labor of certain races to come in from the East. We restricted immigration at that time; and what we are up against in this bill is, it seems to me, whether or not we believe in a restrictive immigration policy. If we do, we can not apply that policy alone to the Atlantic shore, and say that we of the Pacific will blow holes in it and eat it away whenever we are concerned.

That strikes me as being one of the things that we must determine in this bill. I recognize its difficulties, and I recognize that it may work some hardship. I should like to have an adjustment period, so that there may be no hardship at all; but we are finally coming to the proposition, Are we going to permit those upon this hemisphere who are, as we imagine, of a different sort from ourselves, to come into our country, and prohibit those of a like kind from across the Atlantic from coming in at all?

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President—

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will permit me to reply to the last statement of the Senator from California, there can not be any dispute about what Congress should do in a case of that kind. The same rule should be applied to the people of all nations throughout the world. I have been devoting the whole of the time that I have occupied so far to a demonstration that the application of a uniform rule, particularly with respect to the visa of passports, has accomplished the desired result. It is no longer a question of whether we are going to have a rigid restriction of immigration from Mexico and from the other countries of the Western Hemisphere. That is not the issue at all. The only question that is left open is, Are we going to maintain the restrictions that we now have in actual force and effect? The

number of immigrants from Mexico has been so radically reduced by a firm application of the existing immigration law that the opportunity for the period of adjustment that the Senator from California has suggested has passed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator really believe that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator recall when we put a head tax on them some four years ago?

Mr. HAYDEN. It had a decided deterrent effect on the number of Mexican immigrants.

Mr. JOHNSON. It had a decided deterrent effect? Is the Senator aware that when we put a head tax of \$18 upon them four years ago the year previous 87,000 came over into this country; that when the head tax was on the figures fell to 32,000; but that the evidence is plenary and absolute that more came over in the year the head tax was on than in the year previous, and the figures were exactly as I have indicated? And is the Senator aware, further, that concerning—

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me stop the Senator from California a moment to make an inquiry. Did as many come the following year legally?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no; not legally; quite so, but they came. Mr. HAYDEN. That is the other side of the story. That is a point that I want to develop very shortly; but I am pleased to listen to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The only reason why I instanced that was because I thought the Senator was instancing the visas now as indicating that immigration from Mexico had stopped.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have repeatedly said that only legal immigration from Mexico has been reduced.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, legal immigration. Well, the fact is that there are as many Mexicans coming as before; and it does not make any difference, so far as the country is concerned and so far as the policy is concerned, whether they come legally or whether they come illegally. The number is the important thing and the number has increased.

Mr. HAYDEN. All of which illustrates one fact: That if Congress should pass a Mexican quota bill to-morrow, the effect would be exactly as it was when the head tax was adopted. The Government of the United States must stop them at the international boundary line with adequate border patrol, and we must have in the United States adequate machinery to deport all such aliens if they are in this country illegally.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator may be entirely right, except from one standpoint. He will remember that we heard, in the case of a great financial debacle recently, that the effect of passing a law that was of inconsequential character was psychological. Now, it may be that we would have the psychological effect by the passage of the Senator's bill; and by a little renewed activity, then, in endeavoring to discover those who had come here illegally, we would deter the coming of those illegally who had been accustomed just to walk across the border in the past.

Mr. HAYDEN. The psychological effect would undoubtedly be good from that angle. Upon the other hand, in my judgment, it would be very bad psychology with respect to the social, the economic, and the political relations between this country and our nearest neighbor on the south.

If practically the same result can be accomplished by close cooperation between the two governments, by an entire accord between the United States and Mexico, and without any discrimination in the enforcement of a law that is generally applicable to every nation in the world, then I say that it would be bad psychology to enact a law which would do no more, and probably not as much, as is now being accomplished by the State Department through our consuls in Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it a gentlemen's agreement, such as we heard of in the past, that the Senator suggests between the two governments?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the responsible authorities of the Mexican Government have announced consistently for years that they do not desire their people to leave their country. When the American Government, through its consuls, applied as strictly in Mexico as they did in Europe the provisions of section 3 of the immigration act of 1917, which provides that visas shall not be granted to contract laborers, to illiterates, and to those likely to become a public charge, and so forth, the Mexican Government did not object. Upon the other hand, the Mexican authorities were glad that this was being done, and adopted a similar regulation and instruction to their own consuls with respect to foreigners coming into their country seeking labor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Admittedly, the visa regulations were of no consequence or effect.

Mr. HAYDEN. The visa regulations have undoubtedly reduced the number of legal immigrants into the United States from Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us consider, then, what other steps must be taken, whether we adopt the quota scheme or whether we trust to the enforcement of the present law, to keep Mexicans out of the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Last summer a select committee of this body took testimony down in Texas in regard to various things, and among others was the matter of violations of the law. Here was an officer of the Government who happened to be collector of customs down in Texas, on the border, and here is what he did in the way of Mexican labor:

Senator BROOKHART (reading). From a perusal of the above, it will be seen that with the possible exception of two of the eight charges—namely, the employment of smuggled peons, and continuance in the importing business—there is no foundation of fact for the charges as presented.

There is certain evidence that Mr. Campbell did employ illegal peon labor. Mr. Campbell was the collector of internal revenue, and he was a witness. I read:

Mr. CAMPBELL. I will admit it.

Senator BROOKHART. Well, do you admit it if you did not know about it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am bound to admit it, because in all the great number of men I employ—men, women, and children—Senator, I am bound to have employed some men, women, and children that were not in the United States legally.

His farm was just across the border, not far from the border.

Senator BROOKHART. But most of them were not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I would not say. That would be a difficult question to answer.

Senator McKELLAR. Give us your judgment; out of the 300 or 400 how many do you suppose were Mexicans and how many citizens of the United States?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, Senator, they were all Mexicans—either Mexican citizens or Mexican-born Texans.

Senator McKELLAR. All right. How many would you say were Mexican-born Texans and how many—

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would say that probably half of the laborers on farms at Laredo, where my farm was located, are not citizens of the United States.

Senator McKELLAR. So that probably 150 to 200 were Mexican laborers?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, sir.

Then he went on to talk about other things. In other words, here was an official of the Treasury Department employing this illegal labor. By the way, I understand his name has been sent in as collector of customs for another term, and will be before us in the next few days. This man was a collector of customs who ought to have been enforcing the law, but he was himself smuggling Mexicans contrary to the law the Senator has spoken of, getting Mexican labor in in that way.

I have read this to the Senator because, as I understood his contention, it was that the present law is sufficient to keep them out. I do not think so.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator thoroughly misunderstood me. I stated in the beginning of my remarks that the legal admission of Mexicans had been so reduced by the action recently taken by the State Department that the number of common laborers now coming in to the United States is practically equivalent to the quota proposed in the Harris bill and less than the quota fixed in the bill introduced by Congressman JOHNSON.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. In just a moment. I said further that the President of the United States should commend the officials of the United States Immigration Service for their activity in deporting Mexicans unlawfully in the United States, and that he should actively urge the immediate enactment of necessary legislation to create an adequate force to patrol the border in order to keep out all who seek to enter unlawfully.

If the Senator from Tennessee will reflect for just a moment, I believe that he will agree with me that if Congress should enact a Mexican quota bill to-morrow, and did nothing more than that, Mexicans would continue to come across the border unlawfully just the same as they have heretofore. It is exactly the same as was the enactment of the prohibition law, or any



other law, the statute is valueless without an honest attempt to enforce it.

It will be a mere gesture, as everybody knows, and therefore Congress must do the other necessary things regardless of whether a quota for Mexico is adopted or whether the present visa control system continues in operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I admit that it depends on the officials, and I called this matter to the Senator's attention because here was an official of the American Government owning a farm himself just on this side of the line bringing in these Mexican laborers who were not under the law permitted to come in. I am wondering whether we should not strengthen both the law and the officials so as to keep those people out.

Mr. HAYDEN. There could not be any dispute between the Senator and myself about retaining in the public service such an official as the one he has described. Of course he should not hold office. He should be removed at once. However, the Senator is bound to agree with me that it does not make any difference whether a Mexican comes into the United States in violation of a quota law as now proposed or a law already upon the statute books; if he gets into the United States because there is nobody patrolling the border, he is here.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. The reason why so few are coming in now is that the tens of thousands of Mexicans now in California and Arizona and other States are idle, conditions are dull here, and they can not get jobs. That is true of Canada and true elsewhere. That is the reason why the immigration from Mexico has fallen off so much.

Mr. HAYDEN. My information does not confirm the statement made by the Senator from Georgia. We must not forget the important fact that there is even a more severe industrial depression in Mexico than there is in the United States at the present moment. Trade and industry are very much depressed, and Mexicans are coming to our consuls seeking visas in large numbers and are being promptly refused. The Weekly Review of World Business for April 11, 1930, a publication regularly issued by the Department of Commerce, contains this statement with reference to Mexico:

Economic conditions remain unchanged, with business dull in nearly all lines.

Let me say further that the general percentage of visa refusals throughout Mexico is now 66 per cent—that is, of every three applicants two are refused formally.

This, however, does not take into consideration the fact that many Mexicans who inquire at various consulates as to the possibility of their immigrating are given such discouraging replies that they prefer not to make their formal applications. There are also great numbers who, receiving word from their friends as to the small chance of receiving visas, have been so discouraged at the prospect that they have not appeared at the consulates. The demand for immigration visas on the part of Mexicans, whether formal or informal, is considered as having decreased very little, if any. Economic conditions in Mexico during the past year have not been such as to prevent many laborers from desiring to come to the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator knows there are tens of thousands of Mexicans idle in this country, does he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know there is much unemployment throughout the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. HAYDEN. Therefore the State Department is even more justified in denying a visa to a Mexican who is likely to become a public charge.

Let me now follow up my original line of argument. I have conclusively demonstrated what the State Department has accomplished. It has taken action which has resulted in a lessening of the number of Mexicans coming lawfully to the United States by over 75 per cent.

What remains to be done? Congress must see to it that if a Mexican or any other alien—I would treat them all alike—is unlawfully in the United States, there is an adequate force in the United States Immigration Service to gather up all such aliens and deport them to the countries from whence they came.

I quote now from the last annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, page 20, as follows:

#### DEPORTATIONS (EXPULSIONS)

During the year 12,908 aliens were disposed of under formal warrants of deportation. Of this number, 9,536 were deported at the expense of the immigration appropriation, 1,458 were deported at the expense of the steamship lines which brought them to this country, 802 were permitted to ship one way foreign as members of crews of departing

vessels, and 1,112 were permitted to depart voluntarily at their own expense.

Of the 12,908 aliens above mentioned, 4,227 were returned to Europe; 2,185 to Canada; 5,481 to Mexico; 570 to other countries in the Western Hemisphere.

That shows commendable activity. My information is that the department does not have funds enough and does not have men enough to deport all the aliens from the United States who ought to have been put out of the country long ago. That statement is justified, I think, by the recommendations made by the commissioner general, Mr. Hull. At the close of his report he said:

That Congress sufficiently increase its appropriation to the bureau to make possible stricter enforcement of the immigration laws, inasmuch as in recent years the immigration question has become one of the Nation's greatest problems. The available force is doing wonderful work in the enforcement of the present law, but naturally a larger force would be in a better position to enforce this very popular law.

He speaks highly of the character of the men he has engaged in that and the general work of the bureau. I quote further:

I wish to pay tribute to the intelligence, loyalty, and devotion to duty of the field and bureau personnel, which have made possible the discharge during the past year of the great responsibilities imposed upon the bureau by the immigration laws. I desire also to thank you and the other officials of the department for the sympathetic and helpful aid at all times extended.

In his testimony before the Committee on Appropriations on the bill providing appropriations for the Department of Labor for the current fiscal year I find this statement by Hon. Robt. Carl White, Assistant Secretary of Labor:

#### IMMIGRATION SERVICE

For instance, while the total appropriation recommended for the Immigration Service is larger than the appropriation for the present year, I will call your attention to the fact that the work of this service is increasing and developing in greater proportion than the increase in appropriations.

To mention a few of these developments, new international bridges, ferries, tunnels, are being constructed. A great number of new paved highways are being opened across our land boundaries. All of these things result in greatly increased traffic, with its attendant problems.

Then there is the new development of aircraft. Already we have a multiplicity of demands to open ports of entry for the admission of aliens by aircraft with many more applications in the offing.

It is needless to say that each port opened will require new employees and the expenditure of more money. It is obvious that the department and the bureau can not always foresee all of such developments one year in advance; although experience has shown that some kind of emergencies are sure to arise, and since this service is a law-enforcement service these new developments must be taken care of.

In the past this has been accomplished by the curtailing or the elimination of certain other activities. And I might add that this condition may again arise during the year 1930.

It has always seemed to me that in justice to this law-enforcement service in making appropriations it would be well to give the Immigration Service a margin of several hundred thousand dollars to take care of unforeseen emergencies as they arise. This does not mean that the money would necessarily need to be expended. Any unused portion could be returned to the Treasury at the end of the year.

For the past several years this service has been compelled to forego activities toward the latter part of the fiscal year in order to keep within the appropriation, and to me it hardly seems fair to a service of this kind to be asked to expend an appropriation of six to eight million dollars, knowing before the year starts that its regular activities will require the use of the entire appropriation.

If more money is needed to carry on the good work of deporting aliens unlawfully in the United States, the President can quickly obtain the funds to pay for that service by submitting a request to Congress for the necessary appropriations, which I have no doubt Congress would grant them without delay. Let me repeat, the President ought to let the country know of the good work done by the United States Immigration Service, and he should see to it, through estimates submitted through the Budget, that the Immigration Service force is increased so that it will be no longer safe for any alien who is not here lawfully to remain in the United States. That is the only answer there is to the question of how to dispose of aliens who have surreptitiously entered the United States, and no Senator and no Representative will publicly condone any laxity on the part of the Immigration Service in the enforcement of the law as it now exists.

I have here a recent statement by the Commissioner General of Immigration, published in the United States Daily on March 24, 1930. Mr. Hull said:

During the last fiscal year 42,385 immigrants from our Mexican neighbors were legally admitted into this country.

In a footnote he states:

Of this number, 38,980 came with the intention of becoming permanent residents. These fall into the following occupational groups: Unskilled or common laborers, 11,581; farm laborers, 3,167; skilled workers, 4,252; servants, 1,266; professionals, 732; miscellaneous, 1,295; no occupation specified, 16,687; total, 38,980.

He proceeds:

The remaining but living reminiscence of Mexican labor competition in America is found in the pathetic tale of immigrant "bootlegging" and other illegal entries, day in and day out, across our Mexican border, from which the most far-reaching effects are found wherever workers come face to face at the gates of employment.

Up and down the Ohio River, through the trunk railway lines of the Middle West, upon the farm lands in sunny southern California, in the iron and steel industries of Pennsylvania and Ohio, and at various points of industry, both east and west, north and south, are found thousands of swarthy immigrants from Mexico who gain entrance into our country without complying with any of the formalities of the act relating to immigration. And it is sad but true that the only aid they needed after gaining access to the land of opportunity was the bid of careless and unscrupulous employers, of whom, unfortunately, there have been far too many in the history of American employment.

To these labor seekers the 25 to 35 cents per hour rate of the Mexican "bootlegged" immigrant has ever seemed an economic saving; and thus these employers have not reckoned with the stern results which always come from offending the wise statutory provisions of Nation and State. Nor have they stopped to realize the price which such unethical practices put upon the heads of the native-born and naturalized labor, which, by all the graces of our Constitution and our Government, are certainly entitled to first consideration as constant bearers of the obligations of American citizenship.

I concur in every word the commissioner said in that statement. There is no question at all about the soundness of the conclusions stated. If there are bootleg Mexicans in the United States, and I have no doubt there are many of them, if there are other aliens who have been bootlegged across the Canadian border, we should have an adequate number of men in the United States Immigration Service to ferret them out and to see that they are deported. The service has done excellent work, as far as its funds and personnel would permit, but we must, regardless of what system is adopted for restricting immigration, make it so that by getting into the country the alien is not thereby safe to remain here forever.

One of the best things that happened, and I take some credit for it because I originally suggested the idea, was the enactment of legislation by Congress last year, in the act of March 4, 1929, which made it a felony for an alien who had once been deported to reenter the United States. There was continual complaint made to me by peace officers in my State that criminals out of Mexico entered our country, committed a crime, were caught and punished by sentence to jail or to the penitentiary, and when they were released they were taken to the border and put across the line. The Mexican criminal would immediately walk right back into the United States, and all that could be done was to put him out of the United States again. As many times as he returned he could only be put back across the border again without penalty or punishment.

In the Sixty-ninth Congress, on December 7, 1925, I introduced a bill to provide for the punishment of deported aliens who returned to the United States. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I appeared before the committee and urged its enactment. The bill received very careful consideration by the committee and I was told that at the first opportunity that principle would be adopted. It was adopted, as I said, in the act of March 4, 1929. It is contained in the first section of that act. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the bill which I originally introduced and, following that, the section of the law which from every source is now given praise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEBERT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill and section of the act are as follows:

H. R. 3748

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

December 7, 1925.

A bill to provide for the punishment of deported aliens who return to the United States

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That it shall be unlawful for any alien who has been heretofore or who may hereafter be deported from the United States in pursuance of law to return to the United States, and any such alien who enters or attempts to enter the United States shall be

guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years or by a fine of not more than \$2,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment. An alien sentenced to imprisonment under this act shall not be deported under any provision of law until after the termination of such imprisonment, whereupon he shall be deported.

[Public—No. 1018—Seventieth Congress]

S. 5094

An act making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) if any alien has been arrested and deported in pursuance of law, he shall be excluded from admission to the United States whether such deportation took place before or after the enactment of this act, and if he enters or attempts to enter the United States after the expiration of 60 days after the enactment of this act, he shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall, unless a different penalty is otherwise expressly provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for not more than two years or by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(b) For the purposes of this section any alien ordered deported (whether before or after the enactment of this act) who has left the United States shall be considered to have been deported in pursuance of law, irrespective of the source from which the expenses of his transportation were defrayed or of the place to which he departed.

Mr. HAYDEN. In connection with the enactment of that legislation I would like to read an extract from an article entitled "Tightening the Mexican Border," by Robert N. McLean, which appeared in the last issue of the Survey Graphic:

A number of things have happened; but the most important was the law which went into effect on the 4th of March, 1929, making it a felony for an alien to enter the country illegally. Before that date the Mexican who crossed the line without making the customary bow to the immigration officials was not even guilty of a misdemeanor. Nobody cared much whether he came or not; but if he became a public charge, or a nuisance, or a habitual criminal, or did something else to attract the attention of the law, the worst that could happen to him was deportation. And a harassed Immigration Service, out of an utterly inadequate budget, had to feed him for two or three weeks while the necessary machinery was set in motion to deport him. Then, of course, he was card indexed; and if he appeared again he could be put across the line without delay. But all Mexicans look so much alike to Anglo-Saxon eyes, it was very easy for Juan Garcia to become Jose Lopez if the occasion demanded.

Now, however, if he crosses the line in the night, or wades the Rio Grande, the chances are that before noon he will be stopped upon some highway by an alert patrol and questioned. Then, according to the present law, he can be convicted of a felony and lodged in jail. And it is not the Immigration Service but the Department of Justice which buys his tortillas and frijoles while the ponderous legal machinery necessary to his deportation is set in motion.

Mr. McLean continues in the article as follows:

A third factor in decreasing Mexican immigration is what officials call "the fear of God." It may be indefinite, but it is very real; and the quality is standard all the way from California to Texas.

And that fear hovers over every Mexican colony in the Southwest is a fact that all who come in contact with them can readily attest. They fear examination by the border patrol when they travel; they fear arrest; they fear jail; they fear deportation; and whereas they used to write inviting their friends, they now urge them not to come. Said an American border official:

"A few years ago we used to send plain-clothes men into the public dance halls. These men mingled with the crowd to gather information which we could use as the basis for investigation. The new law has changed all that. Now we send a couple of men in uniform into the dance hall. In a few minutes the people who are here illegally begin to sneak out, only to fall into the arms of a cordon who are waiting for them. A guilty conscience does the job."

In the opening of my remarks I made a fourth and last recommendation with respect to action which should be taken by the President of the United States. I said that the President should do everything within his power to bring about a consolidation of the border-patrol forces on the Mexican and Canadian borders.

This reform has been long delayed by jealousy among the various bureaus as to which shall survive and absorb the other. The President must call upon these rivals for power to cease their bickerings and impose his will upon them. The present quota law will continue to be worth but little more than the paper it is written on if aliens by the thousands can evade it by crossing our unguarded borders. There are ample votes in both



Houses of Congress to enact the necessary legislation to provide for an adequate border patrol possessing unity of command.

The President of the United States in his message to Congress last December stated in the paragraph relating to prohibition:

I would add to these recommendations the desirability of reorganizing the various services engaged in the prevention of smuggling in one border patrol under the Coast Guard.

On January 13, 1930, the President transmitted a message to Congress containing his comments upon the proposal to improve the enforcement of the criminal law of the United States. On pages 25 and 26 of that message, as printed in document form, is a memorandum submitted to the President by Mr. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, a part of which I shall read, as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT: The Treasury has been considering for some time the creation of a unified border patrol, in order that the execution of the customs, immigration, prohibition, and other laws regulating or prohibiting the entry into the United States of persons and merchandise may be made more effective. The following recommendations are submitted for your consideration and transmission to the Congress if you approve:

(1) The entry into the United States of all persons should be prohibited except at points of entry designated by the President.

(2) The present number of points of entry should be increased sufficiently to permit uninterrupted and unhampered intercourse with our neighboring countries over established and customary routes.

(3) A unified border patrol should be created to patrol the border and prevent illegal entry.

(4) The unified border patrol should be a part of the Coast Guard.

It was not until March 27, 1930, that a bill was introduced in Congress to carry out that recommendation. I hold in my hand a copy of H. R. 11204, by Mr. HUDSON, of Michigan, entitled "A bill to regulate the entry of persons into the United States, to establish a border patrol in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes." It is my understanding that this is an administration measure and is legislation desired by the President. That could be inferred from the fact that he did transmit to Congress the recommendation to that effect made by Secretary Mellon.

The bill provides that it shall be a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of \$100, for any person to enter the United States except in the regular way at a port of entry. It then becomes the function of the border patrol to arrest all persons who make illegal entry into the United States.

If the one arrested has upon his person or with him goods which he is seeking to smuggle into the United States, the border patrol would then turn the individual over to the Customs Service to be dealt with for violation of the customs law. If he has intoxicating liquor upon him he would be turned over to the prohibition service for prosecution. If he was smuggling aliens, he would be turned over to the Immigration Service. But the offense for which he is arrested is none of these things. It is for illegal entry into the United States, which is merely a misdemeanor.

The full text of the Hudson bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That this act may be cited as the "Border patrol act, 1930."

#### ENTRY OF PERSONS INTO THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to enter the United States from a foreign country at any place other than a point of entry designated by the President, except that this section shall not be applicable in the case of—

(1) Any person who in entering the United States complies with the regulations prescribed by the President for the convenience of persons residing or owning property on or adjacent to the boundaries of the United States;

(2) Any person who in entering the United States complies with the air commerce act of 1926 and the regulations prescribed thereunder.

(b) Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, in addition to all other penalties provided by law, be subject to a penalty of \$100. Such penalty shall be a lien against any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft in which the entry in violation of this section is made. Such penalty may be enforced or may be remitted or mitigated in the same manner as a penalty for a violation of the customs revenue laws of the United States; but such penalty shall not be enforced if a penalty (whether criminal or civil) for violation of any other law of the United States has been incurred.

#### BORDER PATROL

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established an organization to be known as the United States border patrol, which shall operate under and be administered by the commandant of the Coast Guard.

(b) There are hereby authorized in the Coast Guard, for service in the border patrol, such additional enlisted ratings as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine.

(c) There are hereby authorized in the Coast Guard, for service in the border patrol, the warrant grade of warrant officer (border patrol) and the chief warrant grade of chief warrant officer (border patrol), and persons holding appointments in said grades shall receive the same pay, allowances, and benefits as other warrant officers and chief warrant officers, respectively, of like length of service, in the Coast Guard.

(d) Any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard may be detailed by the commandant to duty in connection with the border patrol, as in his judgment circumstances may require.

(e) The number of commissioned officers of the line on the active list authorized in the Coast Guard is hereby increased by 60, distributed among the grades in the proportions provided for distribution in the grades of line officers by section 1 of the act entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1929.

(f) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish receiving and training stations, with necessary barracks, other buildings, and equipment, for the training of warrant officers and enlisted men of the border patrol.

#### ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the border patrol to enforce the provisions of this act, except at ocean boundaries of the United States.

(b) Any officer or enlisted man of the border patrol may arrest any person entering the United States in violation of this act; may seize any merchandise in the possession of any person entering the United States in violation of this act, or any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, in which the entry in violation of this act is made; and may deliver any such merchandise, vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, or any person arrested for violation of section 2, into the custody of such officers, at a point of entry, or elsewhere, as the Secretary of the Treasury may by regulation prescribe.

#### EXISTING PATROLS

SEC. 5. The President is authorized to discontinue the border patrols of the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Immigration, or parts thereof, from time to time after the approval of this act, when in his judgment such action is advisable by reason of the establishment and effective operation of the border patrol created by this act.

#### EMPLOYEES AND EQUIPMENT

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to appoint such employees and to purchase such motor vehicles, boats, horses, supplies, and equipment as are necessary in the administration of this act.

(b) Any vessel or vehicle forfeited to the United States as specified in sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled "An act relating to the use or disposal of vessels or vehicles forfeited to the United States for violation of the customs laws or the national prohibition act, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be taken and used, or may, upon application of the Secretary of the Treasury, be ordered by the court to be delivered to the Treasury Department for use in the enforcement of the provisions of this act instead of for use as provided in such act of March 3, 1925.

#### EXECUTION OF OTHER LAWS

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of points of entry designated under this act, including the acquisition of necessary sites and the construction of necessary buildings, or in the execution of the customs, immigration, and other laws regulating or prohibiting the entry into the United States of persons and merchandise as a result of the establishment of such points of entry.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect upon its approval, except that sections 2 and 4 shall take effect upon the 1st day of the seventh month after its approval.

It will be observed that under the terms of this bill the border patrol is to be under the United States Coast Guard. Upon the face of it that would seem to be a very unusual way to proceed. The Coast Guard has been a seagoing organization from the very beginning of our Government. It has always faithfully and efficiently performed every duty imposed upon it since it was created in the First Congress in the year 1790 by a bill signed by George Washington as President of the United States. It was not then known as the Coast Guard but as the United States Revenue Cutter Service, but it has been a continuously functioning organization from that day until this. In general, the duties of the Coast Guard may be classified as follows:

First. Rendering assistance to vessels in distress and saving life and property.

Second. Destruction or removal of wrecks, derelicts, and other floating dangers to navigation.

Third. Operating as a part of the Navy in time of war or when the President shall so direct.

Fourth. Extending medical aid to American vessels engaged in deep-sea fisheries.

Fifth. Protection of the customs revenue.

Sixth. Enforcement of law and regulations governing anchorage of vessels in navigable waters.

Seventh. Enforcement of law relating to quarantine and neutrality.

Eighth. Suppression of mutinies on merchant vessels.

Ninth. Enforcement of navigation and other laws governing merchant vessels and motor boats.

Tenth. Enforcement of law to provide for safety of life on navigable waters during regattas and marine parades.

Eleventh. Protection of game and the seal and other fisheries in Alaska, and so forth.

Twelfth. Enforcement of sponge-fishing law.

Thirteenth. International ice patrol in the vicinity of Grand Banks off Newfoundland.

While the foregoing represent the principal duties, it is difficult to enumerate all the tasks that fall to the service, for it is essentially an emergency service.

During all periods of the year a rigid system of military discipline, drills, and training is maintained, better to fit the personnel for the duty of operating as a part of the Navy at any time, as the law requires.

I do not know just how the plan proposed in the Hudson bill will work unless the Coast Guard organizes a land force which will have the same relation to it as the Marine Corps has to the United States Navy. In any event there will be unity of command, a result which is greatly desired. There will be one authority responsible for preventing the smuggling of goods, of intoxicating liquor, of aliens, by land or by sea into the United States. There will be one place to go to make a complaint that the law is not enforced; there will be one authority to see to it that the law is enforced.

Perhaps one reason why the Secretary of the Treasury selected the Coast Guard rather than the existing patrol forces of the Treasury Department along the Mexican and Canadian borders as the nucleus around which to build up a unified border patrol is the fact that the mounted inspectors on the Mexican border are political appointees. I am informed by the United States Civil Service Commission that there is a difference between the Mexican and the Canadian border patrols of the Treasury Department with respect to the requirement as to the employees so engaged being appointed under civil-service rules.

Along the Canadian border we have what is known as customs patrol inspectors, of whom there are 447, all under civil service, and 10 supervisors, who are likewise under civil service. On the Mexican border there are now 169 mounted inspectors who are not civil-service employees but who are appointed upon the recommendation, without regard to civil service, of the collectors of customs. There are also 113 regular inspectors under civil service.

It may be that to avoid the charge of political favoritism the Secretary of the Treasury decided that it was better to utilize the Coast Guard as the basis for organizing a combined border patrol than to use an existing force, particularly on the Mexican border, the members of which are not under civil service.

The border patrol of the United States Immigration Service is a very fine and very efficient force. I want to read to the Senate an extract from the report for 1927 of the Commissioner General of Immigration, in which he pays tribute to that organization. From personal knowledge I concur in all he says:

The border patrol is a young man's organization; it appeals strongly to the lover of the big outdoors—the primeval forests, the sun-parched deserts, the mountains, and the plains—the business upon which it is engaged calls for manhood, stamina, versatility, and resourcefulness in the highest degree. "Honor first" is its watchword; privations and danger but serve as a challenge which none refuses. Unfailing courtesy to all, and helpfulness to the helpless in distress, are emphasized above every other requisite. These young men are proud of their jobs, proud of their organization, with a code of ethics unsurpassed by any similar organization of this or any other day. In the three short years of its existence it has created a priceless store of tradition. The pride of these men in their organization is equalled only by the pride and esteem in which they are held by the communities in which they operate. Spontaneous testimonials of this esteem are being constantly received by the bureau. To an almost unbelievable extent the border patrol is self-governing. Its members must be left largely to their own devices and upon their honor. The weight of popular disapproval of his fellow officers is more potent with the erring one than all the printed regulations humanly possible to devise. The uniform is sacred; it not only symbolizes authority, the law's majesty, and all the power of the Federal Government but it entails obligations upon the wearer in the way of deportment which are intuitively recognized and scrupulously observed.

Ex-service men predominate in the border patrol; they must be and are physically fit; they are accustomed to discipline, take readily to it,

and like it; they are charged with a serious responsibility and keenly realize it. In the vast majority of cases their work is a religion.

In his more recent annual report, for the year 1928, the Commissioner of Immigration says with respect to the border patrol:

In the preceding fiscal year 12,098 smuggled aliens were apprehended. The past fiscal year witnessed an increase of 50 per cent in the number of such aliens taken into custody. While the total personnel of the organization underwent a contraction as compared with the previous year, the total number of actual patrolmen was increased and it was possible to add 35 additional automobiles.

In the four years of the organization's existence seven border patrolmen have lost their lives in encounters with outlaws, two of the fatalities having occurred during the past fiscal year.

My judgment is that in the establishment of the new unified border patrol under the Coast Guard it will be found highly desirable to take over practically as a body the existing immigration border patrol. It is a very fine force, organized under civil service from the very start, and it has made such an excellent record that under no circumstances could the services of the great majority of its members be dispensed with.

For the information of many, who, like myself until I made some study of the subject, were not aware of what a fine organization the United States Coast Guard is, I desire to include in the Record a statement prepared by an officer of that organization which describes in some detail the nature of the service which it has rendered to our country in past years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Owing to the diversity of the duties of the United States Coast Guard, it is interesting to hear comment by persons in various walks of life on what the Coast Guard is and on the duties it performs. The inhabitants along the remoter sections of our vast coast line whose closest contact with any Federal activity is the near-by Coast Guard life-saving station picture the service as an organization highly and skillfully trained for rescuing and succoring the shipwrecked; the Eskimo in the far northern part of Alaska always eagerly awaiting the arrival of the Coast Guard cutter *Northland* on its annual Arctic cruise visualizes the service as an emissary of civilization whose mission is to bring to him tidings of the outside world, relief from his ills and troubles, and ministrations in various forms for his welfare and happiness; the fishermen on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and shipping traveling along the North Atlantic lane routes in the spring and summer, seeing the Coast Guard cutters ever searching for and watching the movements of icebergs as they approach the steamship lanes, speak of the service as the guardian against the ice peril in the North Atlantic; the mariner, yachtsman, or boatman in distress at sea knows that his signals or calls for assistance will at once dispatch to his aid the nearest Coast Guard cutter, and he looks upon the service as an arm of the Government for his protection against the perils of the sea; the smuggler of contraband, trying to escape the vigilance of the Coast Guard coastal patrol, pictures the service as a seagoing constabulary; and so on through the other important fields of service activity there arises a peculiar conception of the Coast Guard usually formed by the nature of the duties on which the observer happens to see the service engaged. It is no wonder then that the average man ashore is confused in his idea of the many things Coast Guard men are called upon to do.

The present-day activities of the Coast Guard represent the assignment and addition of duties along important lines of the public service in which the facilities, training, and record of the corps peculiarly fit it for rendering the utmost in results and efficiency to the Nation. This growth and development goes back to the origin of the Coast Guard on August 4, 1790, when it was organized under an act of the First Congress, approved by President Washington, to meet the need for the services of a coast patrol for the enforcement of the customs laws and an armed force for the protection of the seacoast. The Coast Guard is by law a part of the military forces of the United States, and as such has played an honorable part in every war in which this country has been engaged. Coast Guard cutters captured French privateers in 1799; in the War of 1812 they captured the first prize of the war and distinguished themselves in attacks against enemy squadrons; during the Seminole Indian war they shared honors with the Army and Navy; in the Civil War the cutters were actively engaged; some of the outstanding actions during the Spanish-American War found the Coast Guard cutters in the thick of the fray and their officers and men honored for their bravery by congressional action; in the World War, fresh in our memory, the percentage of battle losses in the Coast Guard was greater, it is reported, than that in the Army, the largest single loss, with the exception of the *Cyclops*, suffered by our naval forces being the sinking of the Coast Guard cutter *Tampa* by an enemy submarine, when every soul on board—115 in all—went down. The war-time record of the service is inspiring and



impressive, and in its dual character as a force for belligerent operations and as an institution for the service of humanity at all times, the Coast Guard has always taken a part in all matters which involved the honor, safety, or interest of the country and the enforcement of the law at sea and along our coasts.

The most important and outstanding work of the Coast Guard is its humanitarian mission of rendering assistance to life and property in peril at sea. All else is subordinated to this duty, and a constant alertness and preparedness is maintained to afford all the help within its means and as expeditiously as possible when a casualty occurs upon the sea or along the coast. This assistance work is performed by a fleet of able, sea-going craft that cruise on our coasts, equipped with every modern appliance and device for rescue and assistance duty, and by a cordon of 276 Coast Guard stations (formerly known as life-saving stations) located at strategic points along our vast coast line. During the winter months along the North Atlantic coast, when the great number of storms add to the hazards of shipping, a number of Coast Guard cutters are designated by the President for winter cruising duty to afford such aid to distressed mariners as their circumstances may require. However, the cutters cruise for such purpose at all seasons of the year. Their work has a wide range, including the pulling off of stranded ships, long searches at sea for disabled craft, often taking in tow large vessels that are disabled and bringing them into port, and the rescue of passengers and crews from sinking craft. This kind of work naturally calls for seamanship of an unusually high order. The cutters have their headquarters at various ports, responding promptly to the calls of vessels in distress. In answering such calls, the cutters are frequently required to cruise hundreds of miles, and at times under sea and weather conditions that tax to the utmost the seaworthiness of the vessels as well as calling for the display by officers and men of the greatest skill in seamanship. They are of necessity compelled to disregard the elements, for it is the rule that the worse the weather the greater the need of the ship they set out to find and assist on the trackless ocean wastes.

The men at the Coast Guard stations on shore look with pride upon the long record of heroic rescues that have been made by this branch of the service in rescuing human lives from ships that were pounding to pieces from the fury of the storm. At these stations we have all the latest appliances and equipment that have potential value in effecting rescues. When a vessel goes ashore in the breakers, close to the beach, rescue is usually effected by shooting a line over the stranded craft and bringing the people ashore by means of the breeches buoy. Often, however, boats must be used, and all stations are equipped with boats appropriate to the locality. Individual initiative and courage are two immediate requisites in the profession of life-saving, and the display of these qualities by members of the Coast Guard is taken as a matter of course. Indeed, no man lacking resourcefulness and nerve can long remain in the service whose business carries with it so much of the element of personal hazard. These men at the life-saving stations who are always ready to risk their lives in battle with the elements, and who patrol the lonely stretches of the coast at night or in thick weather, to warn off vessels that seem to be approaching danger, have a singular and appealing simplicity of character. They are possessed with the desire to be of service to all in the community in even the most trivial matters.

An idea of the extent of the accomplishments of the Coast Guard in this humanitarian field of endeavor may be gained by reference to the report of the latest fiscal year, 1929, when a total of 4,375 persons were saved or rescued from peril. There were 4,419 instances of lives saved and vessels assisted, and the value of vessels assisted, including cargoes, amounted to \$49,128,375. Miscellaneous assistance was rendered in 4,867 cases. This included such work as warning vessels standing into danger; various services to shipping; furnishing food, fuel, and water to vessels in distress; succoring the shipwrecked; medical and surgical aid to the sick and injured; assistance at fires at buildings, wharves, and other structures on the shore line; assistance at floods and other calamitous visitations; protecting wrecked property and cooperating with the local authorities in the maintenance of public order; acting as pilots in cases of emergency, etc.

It is a part of the Coast Guard's job to see that derelicts and other floating dangers and obstructions to navigation are removed from the paths of marine commerce. Currents and winds often carry a menace to navigation far from its originally reported position, and the cutters have to resort to long and tedious searches before locating the derelict or obstruction. Then it is a question of whether it is capable of being salvaged by being towed to port or beached. If not, wrecking operations with T N T mines are employed. Destroying a derelict vessel may be an easy task, but often the task may require days of hazardous surface and submarine operations, taxing the skill, resourcefulness, and strength of the officers and men. During the fiscal year 1929, 267 derelicts and other obstructions to navigation were removed from the paths of commerce or destroyed, when necessary.

As the seal herds annually go from their southern habitats to the breeding grounds on the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea, the Coast Guard cutters pick up their trail off the Washington coast, and during their migration northward in the spring these cutters protect them

against poachers all the way up to these far-away islands in the north. The cutters remain during the summer months in the waters contiguous to Alaska, performing numerous useful offices conducive to the general welfare of the people in these far-distant regions, and carry law and order into the villages which they visit. The *Northland*, the successor to the famous *Bear*, is among this group of cutters, and her duty is not considered complete until she makes her way through the leads in the ice to Point Barrow, the northernmost settlement in American territory, on her humanitarian mission of assistance and helpfulness to the natives and marine commerce.

At regattas, marine parades, boat races, launchings, and marine events, where a large number of water craft may be assembled, the red-and-white striped ensign of the Coast Guard is constantly in evidence in the maintenance of an alert and efficient patrol of the course to prevent crowding and as an assurance of protective measures being taken for the safety of both contestants and spectators.

In preventing smuggling, so often improperly associated in the public mind with prohibition, the Coast Guard is carrying on faithfully and zealously one of its duties dating since its creation in 1790. The officers and men of the service patrolling our extensive coast line in all seasons, with fidelity characteristic of the military service they represent, and carrying on their warfare against the smuggling of contraband and aliens under trying conditions so little known to outsiders, are deserving of a word of praise. In this work the service is simply upholding the Constitution of the United States and enforcing the laws of the Nation upon the sea.

At this time of the year icebergs are making their way down to the vicinity of the steamship lanes in the North Atlantic Ocean, and there is carried on one of the most interesting and important international duties—that of the patrol of the North Atlantic area off the Grand Banks against the iceberg peril by the United States Coast Guard. Through this dreary region, usually blanketed in a blinding fog, there is projected the busiest water trade route in the world, and it was in this area of peril that the greatest disaster ever recorded in the history of ocean travel occurred—the sinking of the *Titanic* on the night of April 14–15, 1912, after a collision with an iceberg, with the loss of more than 1,500 souls. Resolved to prevent a repetition of such a tragedy and to meet the almost universal demand for a patrol of the ice region to warn passing vessels of the limits of danger from day to day during the iceberg-peril season, representatives of the principal maritime nations of the world signed an international convention at London on January 20, 1914, providing for the operation of an International Service of Ice Observation, Ice Patrol, and Ocean Derelict Destruction in the North Atlantic.

This international duty has been carried on by the Coast Guard with great credit to the United States, and since its regular inauguration in 1914 there has not been a single life lost due to iceberg collision in the area patrolled by the cutters. Two of the largest and best equipped Coast Guard cutters are ordered from their home stations and detailed to this important international duty, using Halifax, Nova Scotia, as the base of their operations. The cutters inaugurate the patrol very early in the spring, as soon as the ice begins to push south along the eastern edge of the Grand Banks, and one of the two always remains on duty in the ice area until summer-time conditions so melt back the limits of ice that it no longer constitutes a menace to the trans-Atlantic lane routes. Day by day the cutters keep in touch with icebergs and field ice, determining their set and drift, reporting their presence and location to the Hydrographic Office of the Navy, and broadcasting the information by radio for the protection of shipping. The cutters while on this work also perform such incidental service, not to interfere, however, with the paramount duty of the patrol, as rendering assistance to vessels in distress, giving medical aid to crews of passing vessels, removing obstructions to navigation, and extending such other assistance to the mariner as may be practicable, and conducting scientific observations and experiments for the aid and furtherance of oceanographic knowledge.

To recount the duties the service is daily performing and which it is called upon to do is like passing before your eyes a moving picture of public service upon the sea in almost every conceivable sphere of activity. Harbor cutters flying the anchorage flag of the service enforce the rules and regulations promulgated by Federal authority at our larger ports governing the anchorage and movements of vessels and the lading and unlading of explosives by vessels other than common carriers; lookout towers located at intervals along the St. Marys River connecting Lake Superior with Lake Huron house Coast Guard men who are charged with regulating the huge marine traffic passing through this important waterway; units of the service board vessels at the rate of one every five minutes throughout the year in the interests of the enforcement of the navigation and motor boat laws of the United States; the halibut fishing fleets in southeastern Alaskan waters look to the service for protection during the fishing season; medical aid goes out to the deep-sea fisherman and our seaplanes report to him the locations of schools of fish when sighted; the lone aviator or the transport plane proceeding along the Atlantic coast will find safety and comfort in knowing that his passage northward or southward is being checked from Coast Guard station to station by watchful eyes ready to assist him in

case of mishap; a Coast Guard coastal communication system of 2,650 miles in length throws around the strategic coast section of the Nation a band of telephone lines and submarine cables connecting all Coast Guard stations, and a great number of lighthouses, naval radio-compass stations, and Weather Bureau stations. Being an emergent service, personnel and units of the Coast Guard may be found to be among the first arrivals in time of flood, hurricane, and inundation, bringing with them means for succor and relief, and assistance in the work of rehabilitation.

And so the Coast Guard strives to be of service on any waters upon which its vessels and boats will float. It is an emergent service and must be always in a position to live up to its historic motto, "Semper Paratus"—always ready. There can be no finer duty than that two-fold duty with which the Coast Guard is charged—to defend flag and country at sea in time of war and to serve humanity at sea in time of peace.

Mr. HAYDEN. For the further information of the Senate I shall also include in the Record the following extract from the last annual report of Rear Admiral Frederick C. Billard, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard. This extract shows the attitude of that organization toward law enforcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS LAWS

The normal duties of the Coast Guard having to do with the general enforcement of the customs laws of the United States were satisfactorily performed during the year. This general enforcement of the customs laws by the Coast Guard is supplemented each year by the assignment of harbor cutters and harbor launches of the service at the principal ports to aid the customs authorities in boarding incoming vessels, and in performing other duties relating to the customs.

The law enforcement work of the Coast Guard for the prevention of smuggling of liquor into the United States from sea, progressed very satisfactorily during the year and was accompanied by gratifying results.

This matter continues to be one requiring the utmost vigilance and attention at all times. The service forces are keenly alive to the situation and are unceasing in their activities, afloat, and on shore, to thwart any attempt to introduce contraband liquor into the country. Nothing short of this constant, intensive watchfulness along and adjacent to the shore line, and the cruising over wide areas at sea by the vessels of the service, will serve to prevent the persistent efforts of the smuggler in forwarding, and succeeding in, his design to land liquor on the coast, or in some port, disguisedly, among the large volume of legitimate traffic.

There is no doubt that any lessening of service forces at this time would be followed by an immediate and corresponding increase in liquor smuggling. Some liquor smuggling is still going on along the seaboard, and there remains a considerable amount of such smuggling on the Great Lakes, where smuggling operations are very active.

It has been pointed out previously that it is a problem of no mean proportions to guard the 10,000 miles of coast line of the United States, with its inlets, bays, sounds, coves, rivers, and other indentations almost without number offering potential landing places, against the crafty rum runner who is thoroughly familiar with the shore line.

The service is doing all, in every quarter, that can be done with its present resources. If the sea and lake coasts are to be adequately guarded against this unlawful traffic, so as to meet all the needs of the situation, the forces of the Coast Guard must be augmented both in personnel and in vessels. If this be done, smuggling can, and will be, further curtailed and practically stopped in its entirety. It is hoped that any measures proposed to this end may meet with approval.

The burden of keeping liquor off the coast is no less to-day than it was a year ago, when the commandant had this to say in his annual report for 1928:

"The accomplishments of the service in very greatly reducing the amount of liquor smuggling on our coasts are, it is believed, generally well known. What probably are not so well known are the extraordinary magnitude and difficulties of the task and the persistent determination and energy with which the personnel of the Coast Guard have prosecuted the task. It is not believed possible for any organization, with the same resources in men, ships, and stations, to have done more to reduce liquor smuggling at sea than the Coast Guard has done. Much more remains to be done, but if more is to be accomplished in this matter, and if the great stretch of American coast line is to be adequately guarded, the forces of the Coast Guard must be increased, both in personnel and in vessels. In the light now of much experience it is firmly believed that the Coast Guard can go the rest of the way toward a practically complete prevention of smuggling on our coasts if it be given the resources with which to do it."

It is perfectly evident that the smuggler has no intention of voluntarily abandoning his unlawful pursuit. In plain words, there is nothing to do but to put him out of business. This can be done, and the Coast Guard will do it, if the necessary means to accomplish that end are placed at its disposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is continual dispute as to how many Mexicans there are in the United States. One

other branch of the Government can render a substantial service, and undoubtedly will do so in the very near future, by answering this disputed question, and that is the Bureau of the Census.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator mind stating how many Mexicans he thinks there are in this country?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am very frank to say that I do not know. The Senator from Georgia, the author of the bill now pending, stated that he thought there were a million Mexicans in the United States.

Mr. HEFLIN. Chairman JOHNSON, of the House Committee on Immigration, testified before our committee that there were a million or more.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Kenneth L. Roberts, in an article printed as a part of a recent book entitled "The Alien in Our Midst," says that the lowest estimate of the Mexican population in the United States late in 1927 was 1,400,000.

Prof. Roy L. Garis, of Vanderbilt University, who made an investigation at the direction of the House Committee on Immigration, whose report the committee has published, makes this statement:

In a recent brief survey of "Mexicans in the United States," conducted by Miss Linna E. Bresette, of the staff of the social-action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, it is stated that the number of Mexican immigrants in this country "is now variously estimated at from two to two and one-half millions."

According to this survey "the five Southwestern States visited have a Mexican population estimated as follows: Texas, 555,000; California, 350,000; New Mexico, 180,000; Colorado, 70,000; and Arizona, 60,000. No longer, however, can it be said that Mexicans are confined to the Southwest. There is hardly a State where they have not penetrated. Even a considerable number are in Alaska. The Secretary of Labor says, 'We estimate that more than 1,000,000 Mexicans are illegally in this country.' Some of those working with Mexicans say that for every one who enters legally there are three who enter illegally."

Mr. HEFLIN. With the population of Mexico of about 14,000,000, if the figures given by the Senator are correct we have in this country 2,000,000 of them, which is a pretty large proportion of the population of Mexico.

Mr. HAYDEN. Professor Garis, whose statement I have just quoted, wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post in which he makes this observation:

Reliable data indicate that there are fully 2,500,000 Mexicans in this country.

I find in the report of the proceedings of the Forty-ninth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in Toronto in 1929, this paragraph:

It is authoritatively stated that there are more than 2,500,000 Mexicans in the United States at the present time and that half of them are here illegally.

On the other side of the question, I find the following, written by Mr. J. H. Batten, in an article which appeared in the World Tomorrow of January, 1929:

Perhaps the most startling fact in connection with this matter is our monumental ignorance concerning it. We glibly roll off figures about the Mexican population in the United States, all of which, to a large extent, are mere guesswork. During the past year the writer attempted to secure figures concerning the Mexican population in the southern counties of the State of California, making inquiry of those who were supposed to be in a position to have knowledge of the real facts. The returns showed that estimates of the Mexican population of Los Angeles County varied from 65,000 to 250,000, of Imperial County from 15,000 to 31,000, of Orange County from 6,000 to 16,000, of Riverside County from 5,000 to 25,000, of San Bernardino County from 17,000 to 40,000, and of Ventura County from 3,000 to 20,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If to-day a million Mexicans are in the country illegally, do we not confront the practical proposition that our problem is one of law enforcement regardless of what the law is?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is 100 per cent correct in that statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is familiar with the border patrol and the border situation. Does he concede that the existing forces would suffice to undertake to enforce a general proscription against Mexican immigration?

Mr. HAYDEN. The border patrol forces now engaged in keeping out of the United States aliens who seek to enter our country in violation of the law are wholly inadequate. In addition thereto the appropriations made by Congress of money



and the authorizations for the employment of personnel by the Immigration Service for arresting and deporting the aliens who get past the border are wholly inadequate. Let me add, further, that it does not make any difference whether we impose a quota on Mexico or whether we rely upon the application of existing law to keep down the number of Mexicans who may be lawfully admitted, the force to stop them at the border and the force to seize them after they get into the United States and put them out must be maintained; not only maintained but augmented.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not long ago I introduced a joint resolution providing for the taking of a census of all aliens in the United States to find out who they are, where they came from, how they came, and so forth. If we could get my joint resolution passed, we could get rid of a million of these aliens who are here in violation of the immigration law.

What I rose to ask the Senator, however, was whether he knows how many people are engaged in this patrol work on the border.

Mr. HAYDEN. I gave the figures for the Customs Service.

Mr. HEFLIN. My information is that in 1,800 miles there are 240 men. The Senator knows they can not begin to do that work.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Alabama that the existing border-patrol forces are entirely inadequate. I am further convinced that the only remedy is the one suggested by the President, that we have a unified border patrol. I am not particular under what head it is unified so long as a prompt result is accomplished.

I realize thoroughly that there is as much jealousy between bureau chiefs and department heads in this Government of ours as there is among prima donnas as to who shall receive the spotlight. But there must be a single commander, and who shall be the head of this force may properly be determined by the President of the United States. He has selected the Coast Guard; and I, as a good soldier, intend to follow the President and vote for the necessary legislation to place the United States Coast Guard in complete command of this situation. There is no other way out of it. If Senators allow themselves to be diverted from the main project, which is to have a unified border patrol, into a discussion of who shall assume charge of it, we shall never get anywhere.

The fight has gone on for many, many years to bring about a reorganization and a coordination of other activities of the American Government. Every time legislation of that kind comes up for consideration by Congress, each bureau which might be abolished, or another bureau which is seeking greater power, proceeds to lobby with Congress for its particular pet scheme, with the result that session after session passes and nothing is done. The only way, based upon that experience, in which legislation establishing a unified border-patrol service will be enacted, is for the President of the United States to make known to the American people its importance, so as to arouse public opinion behind it; and, furthermore, call upon the carpet every bureau chief and every head of a department affected by it, and say, "I have determined that this legislation shall be enacted. I say to you and each and every one of you that if I find any of you interfering with my plans as to how this legislation shall be passed, you will lose your job." That is the only way in which the enactment of the Hudson bill can be brought about. The President must be perfectly firm about it; and he must not waver for a moment, because, if he does, nothing will be accomplished.

The largest estimate I have seen of how many Mexicans there are in the United States came in a letter addressed to me by Dr. Benjamin Goldberg, of the Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium in Chicago. Under date of September 30, 1929, Doctor Goldberg wrote me:

I am sending you under separate cover a copy of a study made by us on the Mexican situation in this country.

This question is assuming an important place from a public health and economic standpoint in various communities throughout this country, inasmuch as there are now approximately 3,000,000 Mexicans in the United States.

I was interested in what Doctor Goldberg said; so I wrote to the Director of the Census, inclosing the letter, and asking him to advise me as to his bureau's estimate of how many Mexicans there are in the United States. I have received the following letter from the Director of the Census:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS,  
Washington, October 8, 1929.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of October 2 with regard to the number of Mexicans in the United States at the present time.

There is no material available on which to base an exact estimate of the number of Mexicans in the United States at the present time. According to the returns of the Fourteenth Census, there were 738,463 persons in the United States in 1920 reported as born in Mexico or having one or both parents born in Mexico. The reports of the Immigration Commission from January 1, 1920, to June 30, 1929, show an increase of 429,221 Mexicans, the excess of the Mexican immigrants over emigrants. This would give a total of 1,167,684 Mexicans in the United States at the present time, making no allowance for births and deaths among Mexicans in the United States in the last nine and a half years, or for Mexicans who may have entered the country illegally during that period.

I do not know where Doctor Goldberg obtained the basis for his estimate of approximately 3,000,000 Mexicans in the United States at the present time.

Very truly yours,

W. M. STEUART, Director.

I am glad to say, Mr. President, that for the first time in the history of the United States persons of Mexican descent are to be counted separately during the present census. Heretofore they have been recorded as among "All others." There has been no separate designation of Mexicans as a race.

I have here a copy of the instructions issued to the enumerators who are taking the present census. Under the head of "Personal description," paragraph 154, "Mexicans," is this statement:

Practically all Mexican laborers are of a racial mixture difficult to classify, though usually well recognized in the localities where they are found. In order to obtain separate figures for this racial group, it has been decided that all persons born in Mexico, or having parents born in Mexico, who are not definitely white, negro, Indian, Chinese, or Japanese, should be returned as Mexican.

So within a very few months, as soon as the results of the present census are made available to the country, we shall have the answer as to how many Mexicans there are in the United States. We have the record of those lawfully admitted. The difference between that and the number of Mexicans found in the United States should very clearly indicate how many are in the country unlawfully. I have pointed out the difference between the figures of the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico with respect to the number of Mexicans who have returned to Mexico. I have not any doubt at all but that the movement backward and forward across the international boundary line has been quite large. But through the Census Bureau we shall find out as of April, 1930, how many Mexicans there are in the United States. That will go a long way toward determining how much of a problem we face with respect to Mexican immigration. It will not be a matter of guesswork; it will be a matter of accurate statistics.

I pointed out some days ago that the absence of reliable statistics made it exceedingly difficult to say what the effect of the enactment of the quota bill proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] would be. The only information I have been able to find on the effect of the passage of a quota law upon Mexican immigration is in an article entitled "The Menace of Mexican Immigration," by Remsen Crawford, which appeared in the February, 1930, issue of Current History.

Mr. Crawford says:

The difficulty in computing the quota for Mexicans under the national origins plan arises from lack of information as to the number of persons of "Mexican stock" residing in the United States in 1920. The census of 1920 placed the number as "born in Mexico" at 486,418.

And, as I have pointed out before, persons born in Mexico do not constitute all who are of Mexican stock in this country, any more than persons born in Germany would constitute the entire Germanic stock of the United States.

Mr. Crawford adds:

If for convenience of the calculation we assume that persons of "Mexican stock" in the United States in 1920 numbered 1,000,000, the annual Mexican quota should be 1,428, plus a fraction, say 1,500.

The Senator from Georgia a few days ago stated that it was his understanding that the Mexican quota under his bill would be somewhere between 1,200 and 1,500. I presume that whoever gave him that information used a basis for making the calculation similar to that adopted by Mr. Crawford.

In the remarks made by the Senator from Georgia which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1930, at page 6357, is this statement:

This cheap Mexican labor coming into this country and working in the cotton fields of Texas and Oklahoma increases the surplus cotton, and this reduces the price of cotton all over the Cotton Belt. Nothing would help the price of cotton more than keeping out this cheap Mexican labor.

I have attempted to analyze just what the Senator meant by that statement. The Senator holds out to the cotton farmers of Georgia the hope that agricultural labor in the Southwest will be made so scarce by the passage of his bill that cotton can not be successfully grown in that region. A reduction in the total production of cotton in the United States would naturally mean a higher price for cotton grown in Georgia. That would appear to the Senator from Arizona to be an undisguised appeal to local self-interest. Cotton grown in Texas and Oklahoma must go unpicked for the lack of labor, in order that Georgia cotton shall sell for more.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator—and I heard his address—he did not mean that. He wanted to keep that cotton from being produced out in Oklahoma and Texas by this cheap labor. If they did not produce it they would not have to pick it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not believe there is any misunderstanding of what the Senator from Georgia meant. I think we both concur; but let us inquire as to what is going to happen to the land and the farmers who own the farms in Oklahoma and Texas who have been growing this cotton?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I do not understand that the Senator favors working cheap Mexican labor in Oklahoma or anywhere else to compete with American labor which gets a fair price and demands a fair price for work.

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly do not. But the point I want to bring out in the course of the discussion is that the enactment of the Harris bill would have no such effect.

I find a similar idea expressed in the statement written for the House Committee on Immigration by Professor Garis, when he said:

According to the Business Men's Commission, previously referred to, the cotton acreage in the United States rose from 33,036,000 acres in 1922 to 48,730,000 in 1926, the increase in the main being due to the development of cotton production in the Southwest on land formerly used for grazing. But for the subsidy resulting from cheap Mexican labor much of this land would be below the margin of cultivation under existing conditions. This normally submarginal land has added to the surplus cotton crops of recent years and has tended to lessen the profits of all producers of cotton in this country. Only by the elimination of this cheap labor and the introduction of labor-saving machinery, with the farming done by American labor can we hope to see prosperity return to this phase of agriculture.

That may be true with respect to what the professor calls submarginal lands in west Texas and Oklahoma, where cotton is grown without irrigation, but the lands where cotton is produced in New Mexico, in Arizona, and in southern California are lands worth a minimum of \$200 per acre, lands where cotton is grown under irrigation, not as the major or the staple crop, but as a part of a well-ordered rotation of agricultural crops.

If seasonal agricultural labor can not be obtained from Mexico, the farmers of the Southwest will seek help from other sources to grow and to harvest their crops. What other sources are there for agricultural labor? One of the chief sources is the negro population of the South. There are 5,000,000 or more negroes in the United States engaged in agricultural pursuits. The Senators from Georgia, from Alabama, from Mississippi, and other Senators from the South can not blame the organized farmers of the Southwest if they send labor agents into their States to persuade the negroes who now help grow cotton there to go West, where they can make more money. The payment for picking cotton is 50 per cent higher throughout the Southwest than in the South. The Senator from Alabama can correct me if I am mistaken, but I understand the current rate for picking cotton is about 1 cent a pound throughout the South. Am I correct in that regard?

Mr. HEFLIN. That probably is the average.

Mr. HAYDEN. The minimum rate in Arizona is 1½ cents, and 2 cents per pound is paid for picking long-staple Egyptian cotton.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does that mean in terms of day wages?

Mr. HEFLIN. It would be \$1 a hundred.

Mr. HAYDEN. If an ordinary picker could pick 150 pounds a day, he would make \$1.50 in Alabama. If he picked 150 pounds of long-staple cotton in Arizona at 2 cents a pound, he would make \$3 a day.

Mr. HEFLIN. And the cotton producer in Alabama is now selling cotton below the cost of production, and the farmer does not get anything.

Mr. BROUSSARD. That is true also with regard to sugar.

Mr. HAYDEN. I fully sympathize with the statement the Senator makes in that regard, and know that it is true.

Mr. President, it has been very clearly pointed out in the report made to the House of Representatives by the Congressman from Washington, Mr. JOHNSON, that when the quota law was enacted a vacuum was created in this country by the interference with the free flow of common labor from Europe. This vacuum sucked in Mexicans, they being the nearest source of supply for that kind of labor. To apply a quota instantly along the southern border of the United States would create another vacuum so far as the demand for agricultural labor is concerned, and if it could not be filled from Mexico, it would have to be filled from some other source in order that a level might again be established.

I have stated that the most likely place to get agricultural labor would be in the South, not only by following lines of railroad communication, but in recent years transcontinental highways have been vastly improved, and it does not take more than 10 days for one to leave any part of the South and get out to the Pacific coast. There is a continual, natural, normal drift of the colored population from the South into southern California and the Southwest. The migration is along isothermal lines. They will go from one warm climate into another, and that is exactly what is sure to happen as an after effect of the adoption of a drastic quota law so far as agricultural labor is concerned.

Nothing will stop the growing in the Southwest of cotton and lettuce and cantaloupes and other crops which require much hand labor. A quota law may change the character of the laborers who perform the work, but the land will still be cultivated, the crops will still be harvested.

I have never believed that it was wise to unduly encourage the growth of cotton in the Southwest, and hope that it will never become a 1-crop country. I thoroughly believe in the diversification of crops, but cotton is a good rotation crop. It is ordinarily a fair cash crop, and no farmer can be criticized if he devotes a part of his land each year to its production.

There is one other source of labor which might be obtained as a substitute in the Southwest for Mexican labor, which has heretofore been freely obtained, and that is to import, not colored American citizens from the South but other American citizens from the island of Porto Rico. Many people do not understand that Porto Rico is an integral part of the United States. It has been annexed to the United States just as Hawaii was annexed. Any person born in Hawaii or in Porto Rico is just as much an American citizen as though he were born in continental United States.

The population of Porto Rico in 1920 was 1,300,000. It is estimated that under the present census there will be found to be over a million and a half people there, a million and a half people on a small island about 100 miles long and about 35 miles wide. The total area of the island of Porto Rico is only 3,435 square miles. It is not as large as either Gila or Graham County in my State. It has a population per square mile that closely approximates that of Belgium, one of the most thickly populated countries of the world. In a recent report made by the Governor of Porto Rico he estimates the population per square mile to be over 400.

There have been organized efforts made at various times to secure agricultural laborers from Porto Rico, particularly for work in Hawaii and in Arizona. Being American citizens, the Porto Rican people are free to come and go as they see fit.

In order to make that point perfectly clear, I ask that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an extract from the United States Code, title 48, section 734, which appears on page 1615, which reads as follows:

All inhabitants continuing to reside in Porto Rico who were Spanish subjects on the 11th day of April, 1899, and then resided in Porto Rico, and their children born subsequent thereto, shall be deemed and held to be citizens of Porto Rico subject to the provisions of section 5, title 8, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States, except such as shall have elected to preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain on or before the 11th day of April, 1900, in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain entered into on the 11th day of April, 1899; and they, together with such citizens of the United States as may



reside in Porto Rico, shall constitute a body politic under the name of the people of Porto Rico, with governmental powers as hereinafter conferred and with power to sue and be sued as such.

From that law it appears that shortly after the annexation of Porto Rico, Congress created a special form of citizenship in that island. By the passage of the act of March 2, 1917, all Porto Rican citizens became American citizens. Section 5 of that act provides:

SEC. 5. That all citizens of Porto Rico, as defined by section 7 of the act of April 12, 1900, "temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," and all natives of Porto Rico who were temporarily absent from that island on April 11, 1899, and have since returned and are permanently residing in that island, and are not citizens of any foreign country, are hereby declared, and shall be deemed and held to be, citizens of the United States.

I insert these quotations from the Federal statutes in the RECORD because, as I have stated before, there are so many people who can not be convinced that Porto Ricans are American citizens and are, by virtue of their citizenship, entitled to seek employment wherever opportunity may offer throughout the United States.

There have been various organized efforts made to transplant agricultural laborers in considerable bodies from the island of Porto Rico. I was told by the late Delegate from Hawaii, Prince Jonah Kaimanawa, that the sugar interests of the Hawaiian Islands, being in need of labor some years ago, sent a ship to Porto Rico and invited all who desired to work in the cane there to board the ship and they would be provided with free transportation. The Delegate said that this turned out to be a most miserable failure as a means of recruiting farm labor.

What happened was that the jails of the city of San Juan were emptied, the ship was loaded with vagabonds and others of like character gathered off the streets, and it was finally necessary to hang a number of them in Honolulu before the experiment was completed. Later importations of laborers from Porto Rico have been much more carefully selected, and I am informed there are now about 7,000 of them in the Hawaiian Islands.

A few years ago the Arizona Cotton Growers' Association sought to secure agricultural laborers in Porto Rico and likewise sent a ship there. They made the same mistake as the Hawaiian sugar planters. Even before the ship left the Port of San Juan a large number of stowaways were removed. I was told that after the ship was out at sea and it was possible to make a count, they found over 40 persons on board who were not farmers at all, but were merely seeking free passage to the United States.

I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a letter which I have received from the chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs relating to these two experiments in the transfer of Porto Rican labor to Arizona and Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS,  
Washington, April 9, 1930.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,  
United States Senator, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In compliance with your telephonic request of to-day I take pleasure in inclosing herewith a hastily prepared memorandum reference the emigration from Porto Rico of laborers to the United States and to Hawaii in recent years.

It is hoped that the memorandum may give you at least a part of the information that you desire, and should there be any further details which you would like and which the bureau can furnish from its records I would be pleased to have you advise me and will endeavor to obtain the additional data that you may desire.

Very sincerely yours,

F. LEJ. PARKER,  
Chief of Bureau.

EMIGRATION OF PORTO RICAN LABORERS  
TO ARIZONA

On July 1, 1926, Mr. E. J. Walker, manager of the Arizona Cotton Growers' Association, Phoenix, Ariz., sailed for Porto Rico to look into the question of needed labor for the cotton growers in Arizona. The first group of laborers sailed from Porto Rico early in September, 1926, accompanied by an official of the Porto Rican Department of Agriculture and Labor.

Information received by the bureau during the first few months following their arrival from such local sources as were available was to

the following general effect: That the majority were getting along well and were reasonably satisfied with their condition; that such dissatisfaction as existed was due largely to agitation inspired from outside sources; that a considerable number had had no experience in the kind of labor (cotton picking and cultivation) that was required; that the immediate increase in their wages over corresponding wage schedules in Porto Rico was largely absorbed by the difference in the cost of living; that the living conditions under which they worked were disappointing to them, the dwellings being of a temporary character, but that certain opportunities such, for example, as for schooling of their children, were better than had been available to them in Porto Rico, and it was expected that their living conditions would gradually improve as the value of their labor became more apparent; that their difficulties were somewhat accentuated by competition with laborers from Mexican sources who had had more experience in connection with cotton cultivation; that the particular type of employment offered them was generally of a seasonal character, and hence employment throughout the year might not be steadily available. It was felt that the Porto Rican as a whole would work into the agricultural work throughout the United States.

The following is contained in the Annual Report of the Governor of Porto Rico for 1927:

"During the year about 1,000 persons emigrated to the State of Arizona at the instance of the cotton growers' association. Some disappointment was shown, but more than 75 per cent of those who went are to-day working there under favorable conditions. About 8,000 Porto Ricans emigrated to other parts of the United States during the year."

TO HAWAII

The annual report of the Governor of Hawaii for 1929 shows the following increase in the number of Porto Ricans:

1920	5,602
1925	6,382
1929	6,923

The following extracts are taken from statements made in June, 1923, by an official who was thoroughly familiar with conditions in Hawaii and who had had first-hand opportunities to observe the results of Porto Rican immigration to that Territory:

"I found the opinion of employers practically unanimous, that no laborer is better than the good Porto Rican, but there is a very definite accent on the good. No laborer who has come to the Territory is more generally to be avoided than the poor Porto Rican laborer.

"A good Porto Rican laborer establishes himself with his family in any agricultural industry and has the reputation of being industrious and reasonably frugal and the children of the family remain in the country, not having the tendency of other people to migrate to the cities as soon as they gain the advantages of public-school education and the so-called broader vision of new opportunities. These children see the opportunities in agricultural industry and generally establish good homes and are regarded as good citizens. \* \* \*

"My observations on this trip confirmed my view of the situation as presented in a letter written just before I left for the tour, that any project for the importation of Porto Ricans should have as one of its basic features an organization that will make a careful selection of laborers, so that the men shall be healthy, taken from the farming classes, and if they come to the islands, to be accompanied by their wives and families. They should come in relatively small numbers, so that they can be properly housed and given a fair start in their new life."

The same source referred to the fact that one group of laborers which had come from Porto Rico was found to be undesirable, due to the fact that they arrived in poor condition of health.

An important limiting consideration in connection with the importation of Porto Rican laborers in large numbers into Hawaii is the expense of transportation involved.

The success of any immigration project would obviously be greatly promoted by such procedure in Porto Rico as would involve careful selection of the laborers based on their suitability for the work in view and upon their health as determined by carefully conducted examinations.

F. LEJ. PARKER, Chief of Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. In his recent message to the Legislature of Porto Rico, Gov. Theodore Roosevelt, jr., has this to say:

Agriculture was in the past practically the only source of wealth of our island. It is still to-day the source from which the majority of our people must draw their livelihood. With the work that has been accomplished by our department of agriculture in the introduction and selection of various cane varieties, etc., our large sugar plantations should be in fairly good condition if an increased tariff is passed by Congress. The ultimate strength of the people, however, depends not on the large plantations but on the small farms. The greatness of any nation rests on its small property holders. In our island it is just these small property holders who are suffering most. Hunger and hardship have been their constant companions. Many have sold or deserted their holdings because they could not or did not know how to make a living thereon.

The Governor of Porto Rico does not directly state that immigration from that island would be helpful, but he indicates it in another part of his message, in which he refers to a bureau of commerce and the establishment of a branch thereof in New York City. He said:

In addition, the branch of the bureau in New York might well fulfill another important but now neglected work, namely, that of endeavoring to see that such of our people as wished to place themselves in some other part of our country, such as New York State, be intelligently aided therein. Much suffering could be avoided by such a procedure and, incidentally, the wealth of our island increased, for our people in the United States are a constant source of income to us here, as they send money to their families continually.

I have no doubt that as the years go on more and more Porto Ricans will come to the United States. As I have stated, there is nothing that can be done lawfully to prevent them from coming here and engaging in any kind of labor, because they are American citizens the same as the rest of us.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from one of the Hearst newspapers—the Herald, of Washington—which I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Herald, February 11, 1930]

MEXICAN LABOR EXCLUSION BILL WOULD CAUSE INFLUX OF FILIPINO POPULATION

Though probably devised with the best intention, the Box bill to exclude Mexican labor does not seem well calculated to accomplish its object. In its present form it is likely to do a great deal more harm than good.

First, it is likely to bring direct harm to the farmers of California and, secondly, it is likely to bring permanent harm indirectly to the working men of the country.

There is a certain class of work which the skilled American workman, who belongs to the Federation of Labor, does not want to do and does not have to do. Nevertheless, the work has to be done and, apparently, the way that it has to be done is through the employment of lower grade and cheaper labor.

It is being done now, to a limited degree, by Filipino labor and, to a large extent, by Mexican labor.

Apparently the bulk of this work must be done by labor of that kind.

If migratory Mexican labor is shut out entirely there will be an enormous influx of Filipinos, and Filipino labor has certain definite disadvantages to the country and to local labor.

In the first place, it remains here and becomes a permanent problem to the States and to the Nation.

In the second place, the Filipinos intermarry with Americans and make a great deal of racial trouble, as exhibited in the recent Filipino riots, which will become more and more aggravated as Filipino immigration increases.

Mexican labor, on the other hand, performs the required function as well as the Filipino labor, or better. It comes into the country merely for the purpose of performing certain labor and when that is performed it goes back to Mexico. It creates no social and racial problems for this Nation.

For these reasons no element of the population of the United States should support the Box bill as it now stands. Members of the Federation of Labor should be more opposed to it than any other element of the population, because, in its present form, it will merely result in stimulating the immigration of Filipino labor and in permanently establishing a large element of Filipino cheap labor in this country, with all the attendant labor complications and social complications and race complications which that involves.

Modification of the Box bill could be made to legally prevent Mexican labor from coming into the country as permanent population and allow it to come in merely on a year's permit, necessitating the retirement of the Mexican labor to its own country before the limits of that permit expire.

A plan of this kind would not only give the farmer what he requires, but would prevent the labor of the country from being threatened by Mexican immigration or by a permanent element of oriental cheap labor.

Finally, it would be the part of wisdom and of patriotism for the American Federation of Labor and the farming organizations of the country to work together in this matter and in all matters considering their mutual benefit and cooperation for the common good.

Wednesday, April 16, 1930

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on yesterday I directed the attention of the Senate to the fact that the State Department, by issuing proper instructions to our consuls in Mexico for the rigid enforcement of the existing United States immigration law with respect to the visa of passports, has very materially

reduced the number of Mexicans entering the United States during the first nine months of the present fiscal year in comparison with the total number admitted during the five previous fiscal years, being in fact at the rate of less than one-fourth of the number heretofore admitted. As to Mexican laborers, those who would be directly affected by a quota if imposed, the average rate of entry into the United States is about 1,600 a year, as compared to 40,000 a year during the previous fiscal years mentioned.

I pointed out further to the Senate that the imposition of a quota would be utterly valueless unless, after such a law were enacted, steps were taken to enforce it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator's figures with reference to the 1,600 refer, do they not, to those who legally enter this country?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. And there are, as I understand, no figures for those who have illegally entered.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no record kept by our immigration officials, of course, because if they could communicate with the aliens to find out how many of them entered they would prevent their entry. I have no quarrel with anyone about any figures that may be submitted with respect to illegal entries. I am fully convinced that they are enormous in number. But the point I want to emphasize is that the mere passage of a quota bill will not prevent the illegal entry of Mexicans into the United States.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. However, if we desire to bring about a real, genuine limitation, it would be necessary not only to have a quota but to have a more effective method at the border to prevent illegal entry.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the point I tried to develop yesterday, and I want to reemphasize it to-day.

Mr. BLACK. Both would be essential, would they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. One is utterly worthless without the other.

Mr. BLACK. But both would be necessary, and if both were combined it would bring about a great restriction of Mexican immigration, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. As compared to previous years, but not as compared to the first nine months of this fiscal year.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator means, as compared to legal entries?

Mr. HAYDEN. Legal or illegal. We must have three things to prevent either legal or illegal entry from Mexico.

First, there must be an arrangement whereby the number to be legally admitted shall be strictly limited. Whether that is to be done by a quota or by the visa arrangement now in existence is immaterial.

Second, there must be an adequate patrol force at the border to see that Mexicans and all other aliens shall not pass the international boundary line unless they have a right to do so.

Third, if aliens get by the border patrol, there must be an adequate Immigration Service force within the United States to seize and deport them.

Mr. BLACK. The point I wanted to make was this: Is it not true that those of us who desire further to reduce Mexican immigration to a low level would be justified in first voting, as one step in the procedure, for a reduction on the quota basis?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not believe that a vote of that kind is necessary at this moment.

As I have stated, the actual number of laborers coming in from Mexico who would come under a quota is only at the rate of 1,600 during the present fiscal year. The quota proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] in his bill amounts to practically that number. The quota proposed by the bill favorably reported to the House of Representatives is 2,900. Certainly there will not be as many as 2,900 laborers who will enter the United States this year if the visa regulations are properly enforced.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I get the Senator's point there if we consider only those that have legally entered into this country; but more could have entered legally, could they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. They could not, because when they applied they were refused.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; but suppose more had applied who were capable of coming and who possessed the qualifications which the immigration authorities had established. There were no legal barriers against a greater admission of aliens.



Mr. HAYDEN. It is true, as the Senator says, that if there were more people in Mexico who could read and write, if there were more of them who were not contract laborers, if there were more of them who were physically and mentally fit to enter the United States, if there were more of them who were not likely to become public charges, they could be admitted. For those various reasons they have been refused admission, and there are not more of that kind in Mexico. The proof of that fact is that thousands of them have been turned away from the consulates. Others have not applied because they knew that if they did apply visas would be refused.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator does not think it would be impossible to find in Mexico any more citizens who could meet the tests imposed by the immigration authorities, does he? May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that they are getting in in some way, as shown by a statement which I placed in the RECORD a few months ago. Whether it is done legally or illegally makes no difference, so far as the actual influx of immigrants of this country is concerned.

I placed in the RECORD on April 30, 1929, this statement from Houston, Tex.:

"Unorganizable Mexican labor in inexhaustible numbers can be secured in Texas for new textile mills," says a bulletin which the local chamber of commerce has just mailed to every New England textile manufacturer in an attempt to bring new mills to Houston.

That was broadcast over the country—that they had at that time in Houston, Tex., inexhaustible supplies of unorganizable Mexican labor. Those supplies could not have come there if only 1,600 Mexicans had come into this country. So, therefore, we know that they had supplies from illegal sources.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not disputing that fact at all. What I am insisting upon and what I want the Senate to know is that there are three steps that must be taken.

Mr. BLACK. I am in favor of taking all of them.

Mr. HAYDEN. So am I. I am just as heartily in favor as is the Senator from Alabama to secure the accomplishment of all three results:

First, to reduce the number of aliens who may enter the United States.

Second, to guard the borders against illegal entry.

Third, to deport those in the United States who are here and have no right to be here.

There is no disagreement at all about those basic propositions. The Senator from Alabama and I disagree only upon the one issue as to whether the action taken by the State Department during the first nine months of the present year is adequate. That is the only issue there is between us.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield there, I will state that there is just this difference:

Even if it be true that the State Department, by the enforcement of rules and regulations, has limited to 1,600 the number of legal entrants during the first nine months of this year, I would still favor an ironclad law, not dependent upon the whim and caprice of any particular individual connected with that department, but a law which stood as a barrier which could not be broken down to prevent importation into this country of cheap, unorganizable Mexican labor in inexhaustible quantities to compete with American labor. In other words, I want an absolute legal barrier, not dependent upon the rules and regulations of the department.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken; the barrier is not dependent upon whim and caprice or upon rules and regulations. The barrier depends solely upon the proper enforcement of existing law.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct. All right. Now let me say this: Here is the difference, if the Senator will permit me: If the authorities desired, in their discretion, to enforce that barrier by a more liberal method toward the Mexicans, they could under the law permit 5,000 immigrants to come in.

Mr. HAYDEN. The American consuls in Mexico could not do that and enforce the law, because the law is just as fixed as a quota law would be.

Mr. BLACK. No; it depends upon their interpretation of the literary attainments, of the mentality, of the moral qualities of the Mexicans. I desire a law which, irrespective of the moral qualities, irrespective of the mental achievements, irrespective of anything in the world except that the Mexicans are about to come in, will absolutely limit to a small number those that come in, especially in this time of unemployment in this country. Let it not be dependent upon interpretation or enforcement, but let it be a legal barrier over which they can not come into this country.

That is the difference, as I see it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to call the Senator's attention to another fact.

I do not know how much experience the Senator has had with the present quota laws as administered by the Labor Department. I have had considerable experience in that connection, and I want to say that I do not think any department of the Government functions any better than the Labor Department does in keeping the quota where the law requires it to be kept. The officials of that department are enforcing that law splendidly, in my judgment. I have had many, many cases coming up under that law from my own State, and I want to repeat that I do not think any department of the Government is functioning any better than that department which keeps immigration within the quota.

Under those circumstances, does not the Senator think it will be infinitely better for this country, in order to keep out foreigners to the extent that we want them kept out, to put the administration of the law under the Labor Department, and not have it kept under the State Department? I pointed out here the evidence of an official of the Government in Texas showing that the law is not being enforced now by the State Department; and it is not being enforced.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is mistaken. The evidence he presented yesterday referred to an official of the Treasury Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it was, but it showed that an official of the Treasury Department could go before the State Department and get all the Mexican labor that he desired.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is again mistaken. He presented no evidence to show that any official of the State Department permitted or condoned the illegal entry of Mexicans.

Mr. McKELLAR. He had over 200 Mexicans here on one single, solitary plantation that were illegally brought here.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us analyze just what the Senator from Tennessee has said. If Mexicans were illegally admitted into the United States they did not come in by the consent of the State Department. They could only come in by the consent of the United States Immigration Service, a branch of the Department of Labor, which the Senator has just praised. I do not believe for a moment that the Immigration Service agreed to their illegal entry any more than the State Department did. The Mexicans to which the Senator has referred must have sneaked around the very limited number of men that are placed on the border to guard it and entered the United States without their knowledge.

Mr. McKELLAR. According to the evidence down there, it was well understood that this was not the law, but it was a regulation of the State Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is once again mistaken. He has presented not the slightest evidence affecting the State Department in any possible way in the testimony that he read to the Senate yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Except that these men were allowed to come in in great numbers, and were being allowed to come in all along the line. Some called it legal, and some called it illegal.

Mr. HAYDEN. But if they were permitted to come in, it was not by the consent of the State Department. If it was by anybody's consent, which I very much doubt, it was with the consent of the officials of the Immigration Service, whose duty it was to watch the border. The State Department had absolutely nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Here is where the Senator and I differ: I believe that if Mexico is put upon the same basis with all other foreign countries, and we put the matter of immigration under the supreme control of the Labor Department, we are going to have that law enforced in the same splendid way that it is being enforced as to all other countries, and I believe that it will be highly beneficial to the people of our country.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator forgets that the enforcement of the existing immigration law is a joint function of the State Department and the Department of Labor. My experience with both departments has been very similar to his own, that both departments are absolutely adamant when it comes to any evasion of the law.

Let the Senator from Tennessee stop to think for a moment. How are the present quotas enforced? Quotas are assigned to various countries in accordance with the law. Emigrants desiring to leave Germany, for instance, know that they must come within the quota. The number of Germans who may leave the Republic of Germany in any one year is known to the officials of the State Department who are located in that country. The applicant must come to an American consulate and he must satisfy the American consul that he meets the mental, physical, and other qualifications of law. If he does, he is placed upon the quota, and when his turn arrives he may leave

for the United States. The enforcement abroad of the existing immigration quota law is done wholly by the State Department, and the American consuls cooperate perfectly with the Department of Labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us do the same thing for Mexico.

Mr. HAYDEN. The difference between the enforcement of the immigration laws at the present moment in Mexico solely by the State Department and the joint enforcement of the existing immigration law in Europe is practically nothing. The net results would be practically the same if Mexico had the quota allotted to that country under the Johnson bill.

I want the Senate to thoroughly understand that the question at issue is not, Shall we continue to have a flood of Mexican immigrants coming into the United States, unrestricted and unregulated? That issue is past. The question is, Shall we maintain the standards now in force? Neither the Department of Labor nor the State Department can be justly criticized for any laxity of enforcement in the past.

It must be remembered that not until 1924 was a law enacted by Congress which really put teeth in immigration restriction. Prior to that time, and particularly during the World War, we had encouraged Mexicans to come to this country to cultivate crops for war purposes. Their labor was greatly needed even after the war was over. They were people of a neighboring country, and no restriction had ever been placed on them. But when the matter was finally brought to the attention of the State Department a rigid limitation went into effect. It has not been in effect for over a year, and I think that instead of blaming them for any past failure, we of the Congress, and, indeed, the President of the United States, should commend the officials of the State Department for what they have accomplished. The President, as the Chief Executive, should let the American people know that the same high standard of enforcement of the immigration laws is to be maintained in Mexico as in every other country in the world. The only fair thing to do is to treat all countries exactly alike.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. Why is it, I ask the Senator, if it is not the fact that the quota basis will prevent Mexicans from coming into this country, that the chambers of commerce of a number of the Western States and the so-called farm leaders of this country, who claim they want cheap labor and must have cheap labor, oppose the quota basis? They seem to think it will restrict the immigration of Mexicans.

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolutions passed by chambers of commerce and farm organizations to which the Senator refers were adopted some time ago and were applicable to a situation where Mexican labor was being freely admitted. What the farm organizations must learn and what the chambers of commerce must learn is the fact which I have been presenting to the Senate for two days, that the old régime has passed, that freedom of Mexican immigration is over. If such organizations have any protests to make now, it is not against the quota, but against the rigid enforcement of existing law. Nobody is going to protest against that successfully, at least in my judgment.

Mr. BLACK. Were there not hearings held before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last week, and did not the Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the committee, receive messages, which were put into the RECORD, opposing this bill and asking for a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture on the ground that they must have seasonal labor for work on the farms, and that they could not get it if we put this quota provision into effect?

Mr. HAYDEN. The admission of the seasonal agricultural labor, which I believe was advocated by Mr. Legge, of the Farm Board, and by other organizations, is the proposal contained in an amendment which the Senator from Wyoming intends to offer. It has been much talked about, but presents a totally different issue from the question of enforcing existing immigration laws.

In my judgment, it will be necessary, under the existing conditions, to enact a positive law to permit otherwise inadmissible aliens to enter the United States to labor on farms for any period of time, and then return to the country from whence they came. There is no authority of law for anything of that kind now. If a Mexican is illiterate, he simply can not come in. If a foreigner from any other country does not qualify according to the strict letter of our immigration law, he can not come in for one month or two months and then go back home. It will take positive legislation to accomplish any such purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is obliged to admit, however, that admissions under literacy or morality tests leave the

matter, to some extent, at least, in the discretion of the administrative officers.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. GEORGE. What the Senator from Alabama insists, and in that I agree, is that there should be an absolute prohibition beyond which they could not go. Of course, within the quota that discretion would still exist, but it would not exist beyond the quota restriction, whatever that quota restriction might be.

Mr. HAYDEN. We have this situation facing us in connection with the bill pending before the Senate. The Senator's colleague [Mr. HARRIS] has proposed the enactment of legislation to place the same identical quota on Mexico as is placed upon European countries, a 2 per cent quota.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of Labor has not recommended any such drastic quota, the Commissioner General of Immigration has not made any such recommendation. The House of Representatives, after considering the matter very carefully, adopted another and more liberal basis for a quota.

The House bill is further distinguished from the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia by applying quotas to all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere, whereas the bill now pending before the Senate applies quotas only to Mexico and the other countries south of the Rio Grande.

We come, then, to a discussion of the proposition of the basis upon which the quota should be fixed, whether it should discriminate as between countries in the Western Hemisphere. All of such questions are very highly important.

I agree fully with the Senator that if there were no other way of restricting immigration from Mexico than the imposition of a quota, and if we had reasonable cause to believe that immigration from Mexico would continue in any such volume as has characterized it for the last six or eight years, except this present year, then there would be nothing to do but to apply a quota, and make it firm and rigid. But in doing that we must remember that Congress may offend the pride of our closest neighbor. The enactment of such a law would interfere with intimate business and social relations between two countries having a common boundary. That is the other side of the question which Congress should weigh in the balance, and determine whether the existing regulations of the State Department, which are entirely agreeable to Mexico and do not offend that country in any way, because they merely apply a rule uniform to all the rest of the world, will actually limit the number of Mexicans coming into the United States to such a degree that it is not necessary to impose a quota. If the present visa system will not suffice, then Congress should impose a quota. That is the basis of my entire argument.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's position. He thinks that, properly administered, the existing law is adequate and that it is being properly administered now.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my firm belief, based upon the facts which have been presented to me and which I have analyzed with great care.

Mr. GEORGE. But if there are those of us who do not feel that way about it we think it is perfectly legitimate to say that we do not want the matter of the number coming in from Mexico left in the discretion of the administrative officers. We want that fixed by absolute law.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no quarrel with any Senator because he votes for a Mexican quota for the reason that he lacks faith in the integrity and the ability of our State Department to properly enforce the law, who believes that for any reason all discretion should be removed from that department. But as one who lives in a State bordering on Mexico, with whose people I am somewhat familiar, who has many constituents interested in business on each side of the line, who knows how closely interwoven our commercial, social, and economic interests are, I claim that under existing conditions it is not necessary to give offense to a good and friendly neighbor, one with whom we are endeavoring to bring about the closest relations of every character, by imposing a quota which naturally the Mexicans resent as a discrimination against them as a people.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I want to state that it is not a question of questioning the good faith or the ability of the State Department or the administrative officers, but the question, as I see it, is this: It is conceded on all hands to-day that there are millions and millions of men and women without employment in this Nation. Therefore the most vital question confronting this Government is, Can we put them to work in gainful occupations?



It is clear that every immigrant who comes into our boundaries must take away the job of some one or live in idleness, unless he comes in with a fortune already accumulated. Therefore, I consider the most important question that confronts us to be the providing of employment for those without jobs, and the feeding of the hungry. So I am not willing to leave any possibility of escape from enforcement of the law to any department. I want to make it absolutely binding on every department of the Government.

If I had my way, I would close the gates of this country to every foreign immigrant from every land in the world, for five years, at least, until it is possible to give employment to those American citizens who are to-day without it.

Let me call the Senator's attention to this fact, then I will not disturb him any further. When I say I would close the gates, I have in mind the fact that numerous countries abroad prevent Americans coming into their countries to-day and getting positions, unless proof is first made that every native citizen of that country is at work. We will not offend anybody by following a policy which is followed all over Europe to-day. They provide jobs for their own citizens before they bring in immigrants to work at cheaper wages.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard of such instances recently in England and in Canada, and there could be no objection among all the nations of the earth if we adopted the same rule which requires the employment of Americans instead of foreigners. The Senator has made an excellent argument for prohibiting all immigration. In the present state of unemployment I would vote for such a bill if I had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BLACK. I can not get the bill out of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Were the idea presented upon this floor by bill or by amendment, it would have my support. My only objection to anything the Senator has said is that, instead of making the rule uniform for all countries throughout the world, he proposes to single out one country, which is our nearest and closest neighbor, and say, "Your people shall not come in." To that I object.

Mr. President, yesterday, toward the close of my remarks, I caused to be read at the desk an editorial printed in one of the Washington newspapers entitled "Mexican Labor Exclusion Bill Would Cause Influx of Filipino Population."

I had intended to say at the first opportunity that I do not agree with the editorial in its entirety, particularly one paragraph, which reads as follows:

There is a certain class of work which the skilled American workman, who belongs to the Federation of Labor, does not want to do and does not have to do. Nevertheless, the work has to be done and, apparently, the way that it has to be done is through the employment of lower grade and cheaper labor.

I know of no work in our Southwestern country, particularly farm work, which Americans can not perform. They will not perform it for exceedingly low wages. They will not perform it as one or two members of a large gang of foreigners. They prefer to work with their own people. But that Americans are physically able to do any kind of farm work there can be no dispute.

As a young man I worked in the hay fields; I worked among cattle, and there is no harder nor hotter work than to be in the dust and the heat of a corral roping cattle in mid-summer. I felt no ill effects physically from any labor of that kind which I performed. To my certain knowledge in the arid southwestern climate no healthy man suffers from sunstroke regardless of how high the mercury may go.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRAZIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. The Senator just stated that he would favor my bill providing for a suspension of all immigration for five years. I would like to state to the Senator that I expect to offer it later as an amendment to the pending measure.

Mr. HAYDEN. Such an amendment shall have my vote because I am convinced there is serious unemployment in the United States. I might add that there is one other thing that could be done which would materially alleviate the situation, and that is to provide the United States Immigration Service with sufficient funds and sufficient men to ferret out and deport the hundreds of thousands of aliens who, we are told, are illegally in the United States holding jobs at the present moment. Every one of those who was put out of the United States would create a vacancy that could be filled by some American citizen. The latter proposal would be even more efficient and effective than stopping every kind of an alien from coming into the United States.

Mr. BLACK. I would like to state to the Senator that I thoroughly approve of his idea. We have not had sufficient appropriations for the purpose of enforcing the law, and they should be enlarged.

Mr. HAYDEN. The enactment of any law—quota law, prohibition law, or any other kind of law—the mere spreading of it upon the statute books, is a vain and fruitless thing. There must be adequate enforcement of any such law. I am convinced that the statement made by the Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. Congress has not made sufficient appropriations and has not provided adequate personnel so that the United States Immigration Service could carry on the activities delegated to it by law.

In further confirmation of what I have said with respect to the ability of Americans to perform manual labor in the Southwest, I desire to read from an article published in the Saturday Evening Post of February 8, 1930, entitled "The Mexicanization of American Business," by Prof. Roy L. Garis, professor of economics at Vanderbilt University. Professor Garis, in the following words, quotes an authority very well known in California:

It is said that Americans will not work at this class of labor and that climatic conditions are such as to make it impossible for white labor to do the work. Dr. Paul S. Taylor and a host of persons who have worked under the most trying climatic conditions in California refute the latter claim. Doctor Taylor states: "It is sometimes maintained that white labor can not do heavy work under Imperial Valley conditions; but while the temperature is very high during cantaloupe-picking season and consequent discomfort is great, the absence of white pickers at the present time can not be laid to inability to endure the heat. Statements to this effect by reliable white persons who have themselves picked melons in company with many other whites are corroborated by the observations of early labor investigators."

Mr. President, in connection with the enactment of any legislation imposing a quota upon the countries of Latin America we should take into consideration the ultimate effect of the passage of such a law. In his report upon H. R. 10343 the Representative from Washington, Mr. JOHNSON, mentioned the necessity for a quota for the West Indies in these words:

The committee has thought it best to round out the program of quantitative restriction, the quota system, by placing those countries of the West Indies, which are not dependencies drawing their quotas from the mother countries, on a quota basis.

Several reasons are apparent. One is that when a restriction is applied in one place the demand immediately sucks in immigration from another. This was predicted at the time the immigration act of 1924 was enacted. Mexican immigration of the peon type increased immediately.

Let me invite particular attention to the words, "the demand immediately sucks in immigration from another." If a rigid quota is imposed upon Mexico a void will be created, a vacuum, as Representative JOHNSON said, which must be filled. If nothing is done to prevent the admission of cheap labor from other sources where the quota is not applicable, we will have a repetition of what occurred in 1924. One source of obtaining that kind of labor is the Philippine Islands.

It is estimated that the population of the Philippines is now about 12,000,000. Many Filipinos have been coming to the United States, entering in increasing numbers in recent years. Their first step has usually been to the Hawaiian Islands. I myself have seen in the harbor of Honolulu a shipload of Filipinos arriving there to be employed as laborers on the sugar plantations. There is no immigration restriction against the Philippine Islands at the present time. Therefore it occurs to me that in the enactment of this legislation it is highly important to consider at one and the same time some form of restriction upon Filipino immigration.

The Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] to-day introduced a bill relating to that subject. As I heard it read from the desk, it appears to me that it would accomplish the desired purpose. In my judgment, if the pending measure is to be enacted, some such provision should be added to the bill by way of amendment so that the complete problem may be solved at one time. Why disturb one situation merely to create another which is just as difficult?

There is another proposal pending before the House of Representatives in the form of a bill introduced by the Congressman from California [Mr. WELCH], being H. R. 8708, a bill to exclude certain citizens of the Philippine Islands from the United States. It reads as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (b) of section 28 of the immigration act of 1924 is amended to read as follows:*

"(b) The term 'alien' includes any individual not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not

be held to include Indians of the United States not taxed, nor citizens of the islands (except the Philippine Islands) under the jurisdiction of the United States;".

The effect of the Welch bill is to impose a quota upon the Philippine Islands. It seems to me that it would be wiser to proceed along the lines suggested by the bill introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], which provides that the Secretary of Labor may regulate the migration of aliens from our insular possessions. That would leave the entire question of Philippine immigration in the hands of an administrative authority which everyone agrees is perfectly competent to care for such a situation. It permits selective immigration, authorizes students, business men, and others having a legitimate need to come to the United States, to enter under suitable regulation provided by the Department of Labor. Such a law would prevent the emigration either to Hawaii or to the United States of Filipino laborers whose services are not needed.

The Philippine Islands are not an integral part of the United States as Porto Rico and Hawaii are. The Philippines were not incorporated into the Union by the Jones Act, which is the organic law that governs the people of that archipelago. That there is grave necessity for the regulation of the migration of Filipinos to the United States is generally conceded. The editorial from the Hearst newspaper which I caused to be read from the desk yesterday brings out that fact very clearly. I hold in my hand a copy of a memorial adopted by the California Legislature, which reads as follows:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 15—CHAPTER 81

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15, relative to memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact legislation for the restriction of Filipino immigration

(Filed with secretary of state May 15, 1929)

Whereas the policy of unrestricted immigration as an aid to cheap labor has had a tendency toward destruction of American ideals and American racial unity; and

Whereas this policy has tended to exploit the negroes, the Japanese, and the Hindus, resulting in their regulation or exclusion; and

Whereas Filipinos have not been among those excluded under the immigration laws of the United States in accordance with our national policy of restrictive immigration; and

Whereas the present absence of restriction on immigration from the Philippine Islands opens the door annually to thousands of Filipinos, causing unjust and unfair competition to American labor and nullifying the beneficial results to be expected from a national policy of restrictive immigration: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California earnestly petitions Congress to enact legislation which would restrict immigration from the Philippine Islands, and which will prevent all Filipinos entering the United States who are afflicted with communicable diseases; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly be, and he is hereby, directed to send copies of this resolution to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

I ask to include in the RECORD at this point an article published in the United States Daily on Saturday, April 12, 1930, which summarizes a report which is shortly to be published by the State of California entitled "Facts about Filipino Immigration into California." This report was prepared under the direction of Will J. French, director of the department of industrial relations of that State. I am sure that anyone who will read this summary will be most anxious to obtain the complete report when printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

CALIFORNIA PRINTS RESULTS OF INQUIRY INTO RECENT IMMIGRATION OF FILIPINOS—DOCUMENT, SOON AVAILABLE, SHOWS STATUS OF NEWCOMERS AND HOW THEY ARE BEING ASSIMILATED

A report entitled "Facts about Filipino Immigration into California," prepared by the State department of industrial relations, is now being printed and soon will be available for distribution, according to an announcement just made by Will J. French, director of the department.

According to the introduction to this document, the present publication of the department "is not presented as an argument for or against Filipino exclusion." Instead, "it furnishes data, not elsewhere available, as to the extent of the Filipino immigration into California since 1920; and also data bearing upon the characteristics of the new wave of Malay immigration into the State." The salient facts presented in this bulletin are summarized in it as follows:

1. During the 10 years from 1920 to 1929, 31,092 Filipinos were admitted into the State of California through the ports of San Francisco and Los Angeles. Of this total, 25,579, or 82.3 per cent, were

admitted at San Francisco, and 5,513, or 17.7 per cent, were admitted at Los Angeles.

2. About 85 per cent of these orientals were brought to California, from the Philippine and Hawaiian Islands, in vessels operated by two California steamship companies.

3. The influx of Filipinos into California began in the year 1923, when 2,426 Philippine islanders were admitted into the State. During the three preceding years, the total number of Filipino arrivals was only 1,855, or on the average of 618 per year. During the seven years 1923-1929 the average annual number of arrivals was 4,177.

FILIPINO IMMIGRATION LAST YEAR SET RECORD

4. The largest number of Filipino arrivals into California was during the year 1929, when as many as 5,795 were admitted, an increase of 139 per cent over the number admitted in 1923, when the Filipino invasion began.

5. Of the total number of Filipino arrivals into California during the 10 years covered by this report, 35 per cent came from the Philippines, 56 per cent came from Hawaii, and 9 per cent came from other ports, principally from Hong Kong and Shanghai in China, and Kobe and Yokohama in Japan.

6. Since 1920 there has been a constant increase in the number and proportions of Filipinos coming to California directly from the Philippine Islands. Thus, of the 2,426 Filipinos who arrived in California in 1923, only 218, or 9 per cent, came from Manila and 2,053, or 84.6 per cent, came from Honolulu, but of the 5,795 Filipino arrivals in 1929, 2,609, or 45 per cent, came from Manila and 2,622, or 45.3 per cent, came from Honolulu.

7. A comparison between the emigration of Filipinos from the Philippines to Hawaii and to California strongly suggests the probability that large numbers of Filipinos, instead of emigrating to Hawaii and then to California, emigrate directly from the Philippines to California.

8. Of the male Filipinos who came to California from the Hawaiian Islands in 1921 and 1922, from 30 to 34 per cent were born in the Hawaiian Islands, and from 66 to 70 per cent were born in the Philippines. Since 1923 from 81 to 97 per cent of the Filipinos who emigrated from Hawaii to California were emigrants from the Philippines to Hawaii.

9. Among the female Filipinos coming to California from the Hawaiian Islands, the majority are natives of the Hawaiian Islands.

10. Out of every 100 Filipinos who came to California during the 10 years, 1920-1929, 93 were males and 7 were females. During the 10 years considered there were admitted into California 1,395 Filipino males for every 100 Filipino females admitted. While the ratio of Filipino males to females coming to California is 14 to 1, the ratio of males to females in the total California population is 1.1 to 1.

PREPONDERANT MAJORITY OF ARRIVALS ARE YOUNG

11. Among the Filipinos coming to California the preponderant majority are young persons. Of the total arrivals 4.9 per cent are under 16 years of age, and 79.4 per cent are between 16 to 30 years of age. The total number under 30 years of age constitutes 84.3 per cent of the arrivals. In contrast, the percentage in the total population in California who are under 30 years of age is only 22.8.

12. Among the female Filipino arrivals into California, the preponderance of young persons is greater than among male Filipinos. While among the females the proportion under 16 years of age is 35.3 per cent, among the males this proportion is 4.9 per cent. Again, while among the female Filipino arrivals 57.2 per cent are under 22 years of age, among the male Filipino arrivals the corresponding percentage is 36.3.

13. Seventy-seven and three-tenths per cent of the Filipinos coming to California are single, 22.5 per cent are married, and 0.2 per cent are widowed. The corresponding percentages in the total population of California are 47.9 single, 43.7 married, and 6.7 widowed.

14. Among the female Filipino arrivals the proportion married is twice as great as among the male Filipino arrivals. About 43 per cent of the Filipino females coming to California are married women, whereas only about 21 per cent of the Filipino males coming to California are married men. Only about 12 per cent of the married Filipinos bring their wives with them upon coming to California.

15. There are more single persons and less married persons among the Filipino arrivals into California than among immigrant alien Mexicans, or among immigrant aliens, exclusive of Mexicans, admitted into the United States.

REASONS FOR PREFERENCE TO WHITE WORKERS

16. Very few Filipinos left California prior to about the middle of 1929, but from July, 1929, to the end of that year 891 Filipinos left California for foreign ports. The number of Filipinos who left California for foreign ports during the 10 years 1920-1929 may have been from 2,000 to 3,000.

17. The number of Filipinos now in California is probably between 31,000 to 34,000.

18. Among the hotel, restaurant, and domestic occupations in which the Filipinos find work in California are the following: Bell boys, bus boys, cooks, dishwashers, door boys, hall boys, house cleaners, janitors, kitchen helpers, and pantrymen, etc.



19. Many employers prefer Filipino workers to white workers, because the former are considered steadier, more tractable, and more willing to put up with longer hours, poorer board, and worse lodging facilities. Where a white worker may feel restive and disgruntled because of bad working conditions, the Filipino newcomer is satisfied to stay on the job "without kicking."

20. The average weekly wage rates paid to Filipinos hired in 1929 in certain hotel, restaurant, and domestic occupations ranged from \$11.20 with room and board, to \$18.11 without room and board. The average monthly wage rates of Filipinos in similar occupations ranged from \$66.68, with room and board, to \$73.82, without room and board.

21. The monthly wage rates, with room and board, of 492 Filipinos, hired in 1929 in hotel, restaurant, and domestic occupations, were as follows: 106, or 21.6 per cent, were paid \$50; 93, or 18.9 per cent, \$60; and 64, or 13 per cent, \$75. Of these 492 Filipinos, 59 per cent were hired at monthly wage rates of \$65 or less and only 11.7 per cent were hired at monthly wage rates ranging from \$100 to \$150.

22. Filipinos are used extensively in agricultural occupations, such as asparagus cutting, fruit picking, rice harvesting, hoeing and topping beets, lettuce harvesting, grape picking, celery planting, hop picking, and general ranch labor. Wage rates in these occupations vary considerably, depending upon the nature of the crops harvested, the location of the work performed, and upon many other factors. Hourly wage rates paid to Filipinos range from 30 to 50 cents, and daily wage rates range from \$2.50 to \$5. The lower figures are nearer those at which the Filipinos are more commonly employed.

23. A Filipino labor contractor acts as the go-between for the growers and the Filipino laborers hired by the contractor to do the harvesting for the grower. The labor contractor also acts as an intermediary between his laborers and the grocers and other tradesmen who extend credit on necessities of life furnished by them to the laborers.

24. Between 5,000 and 6,000 Filipinos are employed in the harvesting of the California asparagus crop. The Filipinos are more than 80 per cent of the total workers employed in this work. Among the other workers are Chinese, Japanese, Hindus, Mexicans, Spanish, Portuguese, Turks, and Koreans. There are plenty of Filipinos at present (March, 1930) available in the asparagus fields.

25. Filipinos and others are paid from 90 cents to \$1.40 per 100 pounds of asparagus cut, depending upon the age of the bed. The price most frequently paid is probably \$1.10 per 100 pounds.

26. With the arrival of Filipinos in the asparagus fields the growers were enabled to use more men per acre, which made it possible to have the asparagus fields gone over more thoroughly. The use of more men per acre harvested, however, has tended to decrease the average daily earnings per man employed.

27. In many occupations in which Filipinos find employment in California they are displacing native white workers and others. This is especially true in hotel, restaurant, and domestic occupations. In box factories in northern California the Filipinos are also displacing white workers. In agricultural occupations Filipinos are competing largely with Mexicans, and other immigrant groups of labor, but even in some agricultural occupations the Filipinos are taking the places of white workers.

28. The displacing of white workers by Filipinos and the prevailing racial prejudices against the orientals account for the recent deplorable anti-Filipino riots in Exeter and Watsonville.

Mr. HAYDEN. I also desire to bring to the attention of the Senate, in connection with the question of Filipino immigration, the following extract from the Report of the Proceedings of the American Federation of Labor at the annual convention held at Toronto, Canada, on October 7 to 18, 1929. What I shall read is taken from the report of the executive council of the federation:

During the fall of 1928 posters were displayed in Manila and other cities urging Filipinos to come to the United States to enjoy the great prosperity existing here. Great numbers rushed to the boats to come to the United States. Scores of them died on the way from spinal meningitis and other diseases. They were thinly clad, traveled in the steerage and, when a cold climate was reached, they became ill. Many were buried in the ocean, and when the vessels arrived in the United States the passengers still alive were placed in quarantine.

President Green took the matter up with the War and Navy Departments, the Public Health Service, Senators from the coast States, the Labor Department, and used every other means to stop the Filipinos from coming here. All of the public officials interviewed said they realized the danger but that under the laws nothing could be done, that everybody was helpless, as Filipinos are neither citizens nor aliens.

Nevertheless, the Public Health Service, which is to be commended, investigated the matter thoroughly and recommended to the President of the United States that no persons should come from China, including Hong Kong, or the Philippine Islands, because they were subject to malignant diseases, unless permitted to do so by the Secretary of State. President Hoover issued an executive order to that effect and the indications are that it will remain in force for a long time.

A representative of the Philippine Islands has an office in Washington and he conceived the idea of having the Filipinos in this country work in the beet fields. The railroads made concessions as to fares, and many of the Filipinos were shipped to work in the beet fields. At the same time circulars were distributed in San Francisco calling upon Mexicans and Filipinos, single or married, to go to the beet fields of Iowa, Minnesota, and other States. Information has reached us that this plan was originated by the American Beet Sugar Co.

I read that extract, Mr. President, as evidence that the American Federation of Labor is keenly alive to the necessity of limiting the entry of Filipinos into the United States. It is also an additional argument in favor of the enactment of such legislation as has been proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE]. I hope that, if the pending bill shall become a law, some such provision will be made a part of it.

On yesterday I stated to the Senate that the Government of Mexico has actively cooperated with the Government of the United States in bringing about the present enforcement of the existing American immigration laws affecting visas in that country. I might add, very properly, since I have referred to the American Federation of Labor, that the officials of that organization have likewise heartily cooperated with a like organization in Mexico representing the federated unions in that country. I ask leave to include in the RECORD a statement taken from the proceedings of the American Federation of Labor, which shows how active that cooperation has been and how willing the heads of those two great organizations in Mexico and in the United States have been to work together in order to prevent the migration of workers who are not needed from one country to the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD as a part of the remarks of the Senator from Arizona.

The statement is as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT ENTERED INTO BY AND BETWEEN THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND THE MEXICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, AT WASHINGTON, D. C., AUGUST 6, 1927

Based upon the declaration of principles agreed to at the conference of representatives of the Mexican Federation of Labor and of the American Federation of Labor, held in Washington, D. C., August 27, 1925, relating to the subjects of immigration and emigration, the undersigned representatives of the Mexican Federation of Labor and of the American Federation of Labor at this conference, held in pursuance and as a result of the former conference, agree upon the following procedure:

The methods by which the principles of self-restraint and mutual cooperation on the subjects of immigration and emigration between Mexico and the United States can best be effected and by which the moral, physical, political, and economic integrity of the peoples of each of these countries may best be advanced are twofold. These methods are political and economic; the former being exercised by the Government; the latter through the trade-union movements of the respective countries.

In so far as political methods are concerned, the representatives of the Mexican Federation of Labor agree to recommend to the general committee of the Mexican Federation of Labor the following program for favorable consideration and action:

1. That the Mexican Government be petitioned to adopt a restrictive policy, and if necessary, to enact legislation to that end, excluding all peoples of oriental birth or extraction.

2. That consideration be given to the exclusion or restriction of other classes of immigrants deemed unsuitable to the moral, physical, political, and economic integrity.

3. That the Mexican Government be petitioned to consider and to enact a restrictive emigration policy, which, in substance, shall conform to the immigration law requirements of the United States.

4. That the Mexican Government be petitioned to adopt a method of regulating emigration so as to give full and complete enforcement to the immigration policy herein recommended.

Based upon these considerations the representatives of the American Federation of Labor agree to recommend to the executive council of the American Federation of Labor:

"Continuance of the policy heretofore assumed toward Mexico, viz, the adherence of the present immigration policy of the United States in so far as nonquota basis is concerned toward Mexico."

It is agreed by representatives of both the Mexican Federation of Labor and of the American Federation of Labor to recommend to their respective organizations that they petition their respective Governments to give early and complete enforcement to the following resolutions adopted at the congress of the Pan American Federation of Labor held in Washington beginning July 18, 1927, in so far as it relates to Government action:

"Whereas employers of labor of the several Pan American countries have resorted to the practice of recruiting workers in other countries than their own upon promises and assurances of profitable employment

without guarantee of permanency of employment and without thought or consideration for the well being of such workers or the harm done to workers of the countries for which they have been recruited; and

"Whereas this practice tends to create strife and friction amongst the workers of the several Pan American countries, besides misleading and doing irreparable harm to workers so recruited: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Pan American Federation of Labor calls upon the several Pan American governments and labor movements to give immediate consideration and to take whatever action may be necessary so to regulate the employment of workers of one country to another as will prevent the exploitation of workers herein referred to, that will require proper and adequate guarantee for all promises made and agreements of employment thus entered into, and as will avoid such recruited workers serving the purpose of lowering the standards of workers in the countries to which they may go where the standards are of a higher order; be it further

*Resolved*, That the Pan American labor movements be urged to co-operate with one another, and through the Pan American Federation of Labor to keep the respective labor movements continually informed of economic and industrial conditions prevailing in their respective countries, to the end that trade-union effort may contribute its full share in preventing a condition of international employment of labor that is of great harm to all workers and that tends to divide instead of unite the workers of all Pan America."

In so far as the foregoing relates to economic action, it is agreed that an early and complete fulfillment of the trade-union cooperative undertaking between the Mexican Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, provided in the foregoing resolution, will be helpful to the workers of both countries. It is agreed to recommend immediate consideration and action be given this subject by both the Mexican Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Labor.

**NOTE.**—The representatives of the Mexican Federation of Labor report that the Department of Interior of Mexico has already perfected plans to discourage Mexicans from emigrating to the United States and Canada, and that it is the purpose of the Mexican Federation of Labor to encourage still further such a policy of restricting Mexican emigration.

In so far as economic methods through the respective trade-unions of both countries are concerned, it is agreed by the representatives of the Mexican Federation of Labor that they will recommend to their general committee for approval and adoption the following:

"1. That every possible effort be made to discourage Mexican workers from coming to the United States and Canada.

"2. That wherever and whenever Mexican workers do come to the United States or Canada, they be urged to join the unions of their trades, in affiliation with the American Federation of Labor and that failure to do so will subject such workers to discipline by the Mexican Federation of Labor to the possible extent of expulsion from the Mexican trade unions upon their return to Mexico."

Based upon these considerations it is agreed by the representatives of the American Federation of Labor to recommend to the executive council of the American Federation of Labor that every facility, opportunity, and encouragement be given such Mexican workers as enter the United States and Canada under the foregoing arrangement and understanding, to join and to be admitted to membership in the American trade-unions upon an equal footing with all other workers and that like consideration be given such Mexican workers in their right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness and in their effort for economic and social advancement as is accorded to all other members of American trade-unions.

It is agreed by the representatives of the Mexican Federation of Labor and of the American Federation of Labor to recommend to their respective organizations the establishment of an emigration and immigration bureau, or selection of some one charged with such duties in their respective home offices, to which workers and trade-unions of the respective countries may apply for information on all subjects and developments relating to the economic, social, and industrial conditions of each country and on all other related subjects to immigration and emigration—each organization to bear the expense of such a bureau or office. It is further agreed that such a bureau or office might well develop into an institution in the respective organizations for the development of greater trade knowledge and serve as a useful organizing medium for the workers of both countries.

**NOTE.**—The representatives of the Mexican Federation have advised that the Mexican Federation of Labor is ready and prepared to send representatives of the Mexican Federation of Labor to the United States and Canada to impress upon Mexican workers in the United States and Canada the necessity of joining the trade-union of their calling in the United States and Canada affiliated to the American Federation of Labor at the expense of the Mexican Federation of Labor and under the direction of the American Federation of Labor.

We believe the foregoing methods, if and when put into operation, will do much to strengthen the ties of friendship and of fraternal trade-unionism between the workers of Mexico and the workers of the United States and Canada—

First, by eliminating the elements of exploitation of workers of both countries, thus avoiding consequent friction which so readily serves the purpose of opponents to organized labor in developing ill will and promoting disorder and strife between the peoples of Mexico and of the United States and Canada.

Secondly, by securing the early and full attainment of the lofty purposes and principles agreed to in the conference of 1925.

Signed this 6th day of August, 1927, at Washington, D. C.

MATTHEW WOLL,

JAMES WILSON,

*Representing the American Federation of Labor.*

E. MUJICA,

C. A. VARGAS,

*Representing the Mexican Federation of Labor.*

SANTIAGO IGLESIAS,

*Representing the Pan American Federation of Labor.*

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is one other piece of legislation which Congress could enact which would be most helpful in the present situation. That is the Senate bill 1278, introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE], to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens. A similar bill was passed by the Senate during the last Congress. The measure was reintroduced in the present Congress, and reported from the Committee on Immigration on February 18 last. Some objection was raised to it, and it was recommended to the Committee on Immigration on the same day, but I am advised that this morning at a meeting of the committee the bill was ordered favorably reported to the Senate. I ask leave to include in the *RECORD* the text of the bill and a copy of the report made upon an almost identical measure during the last Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill and report referred to will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The matter referred to is as follows:

S. 1278

A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That an alien who has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence and who has continued to reside therein since such admission shall, upon his application to the Commissioner General of Immigration, in a manner to be by regulation prescribed, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, be furnished with a certificate made from the official record of such admission. Such certificate shall be signed by the Commissioner General of Immigration and shall contain the following information concerning such alien: Full name under which admitted; country of birth; date of birth; nationality; color of eyes; port at which admitted; name of steamship, if any; and date of admission. Such certificate shall also contain the full name by which the alien is then known, his signature, and his address. A photograph of the alien shall be securely attached to the certificate, which shall bear an impression of the seal of the Department of Labor.

SEC. 2. Such certificate shall be prima facie evidence of the lawful admission of such alien. A fee of \$3 shall be paid by such alien to the Commissioner General of Immigration for each such certificate. The money so received by the Commissioner General of Immigration shall be paid over to the disbursing clerk of the Department of Labor, who shall thereupon deposit it in the Treasury of the United States, rendering an account therefor quarterly to the General Accounting Office, and the said disbursing clerk shall be held responsible under his bond for such fees.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect January 1, 1930.

[Senate Report No. 1455, Seventieth Congress, second session]

TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATES OF ADMISSION TO ALIENS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BLEASE, from the Committee on Immigration, submitted the following report (to accompany S. 5093):

The Committee on Immigration, to which was referred the bill (S. 5093) to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that it do pass. A memorandum from the Department of Labor is made a part of this report, and reads as follows:

"Section 1 of the naturalization act of June 29, 1906, provides that immigration officials at ports of entry shall record certain information concerning each alien arriving in the United States, and it is likewise provided that it shall be the duty of such immigration officers to cause to be granted to arriving aliens a certificate of such registry.

"It is understood that following the passage of this legislation admitted aliens were supplied with a simple certificate of registry, but for one reason or another this practice was soon abandoned and for a good many years certificates of arrival were furnished only in connection with naturalization proceedings, and then not directly to the alien concerned.



"The Department of Labor and Bureau of Immigration have long believed that aliens who are admitted to the United States either permanently or temporarily ought to be supplied with some evidence of their status as residents of the United States under the immigration laws. Accordingly, a system of stamping passports was adopted in the case of visitors entering the United States temporarily, and beginning with July 1, 1928, a more elaborate certificate of admission has been issued to every alien permanently admitted as an immigrant. This certificate, which is known as an immigrant identification card is prepared in part at the American consulate where a visa is issued and is completed by an immigration officer when final admission is made at port of arrival.

"These cards are prepared with a view to preventing forgeries, so far as that is possible. They contain certain essential data, including the photograph of the immigrant. They are issued in duplicate, such duplicate being permanently filed in the Bureau of Naturalization in Washington. Without question the identification card is a document of great value to lawfully admitted immigrants. Their possession facilitates naturalization proceedings and otherwise enables the holder to establish his status as a lawful resident. Moreover, the duplicates afford the department a highly valuable and convenient card-index record of aliens who have been admitted for permanent residence. Finally, it is felt that the issuance of the identification card to arriving immigrants is in strict compliance with section 1 of the naturalization act already referred to.

"There is ample evidence that the identification cards are appreciated by those to whom they have been issued since the system was inaugurated in July last. This is in part evidenced by the fact that there has been a very considerable demand for similar certificates from immigrants who were admitted prior to July, but no provision has been made for the issuance of documents of any kind in such cases. The purpose of the proposed legislation attached hereto is to enable the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, to provide aliens who are lawfully resident in the United States with certificates of admission of residence similar to those now issued to arriving immigrants.

"As already pointed out the naturalization law evidently contemplates that some such document shall be issued to arriving aliens, but that having been neglected some doubt has been raised as to whether the department would be justified under the law in providing every legally resident alien who might apply with a similar document. The proposed legislation if enacted would, of course, remove all doubt in this regard and, moreover, would through the modest charge of \$3 for each certificate issued reimburse the Government, at least to a large extent, for the expense that would necessarily be incurred in putting the proposed system into effect."

A letter from the Secretary of Labor is also made a part of this report, and reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,  
Washington, January 2, 1929.

Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your letter of December 26, 1928, inclosing a copy of Senate bill 5093, by Senator BLEASE, "To authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes," I have to make the following comment: The general demand on the part of aliens for the issuance of certificates of admission as proposed in S. 5093 is indicated in the very large number of requests from aliens for a certificate since the adoption by this department of the granting of identification cards to presently arriving aliens, which is done under section 1 of the naturalization act of June 29, 1906.

The section of the naturalization act referred to provides that immigration officials at ports of entry shall record certain information concerning each alien arriving in the United States, and it is likewise provided that it shall be the duty of such immigration officers to cause to be granted to arriving aliens a certificate "of such registry."

It is understood that following the passage of this legislation admitted aliens were supplied with a simple certificate of registry, but for one reason or another this practice was soon abandoned, and for a good many years certificates of arrival were furnished only in connection with naturalization proceedings, and then not directly to the alien concerned.

The department and Bureau of Immigration have long believed that aliens who are admitted to the United States, either permanently or temporarily, ought to be supplied with some evidence of their status as residents of the United States under the immigration laws. Accordingly a system of stamping passports was adopted in the case of visitors entering the United States temporarily, and beginning with July 1, 1928, a more elaborate certificate of admission has been issued to every alien permanently admitted as an immigrant. This certificate, which is known as an "immigrant identification card," is prepared in part at the American consulate where a visa is issued and is completed by an immigration officer when final admission is made at port of arrival. These cards are prepared with a view to preventing forgeries so far as that is possible. They contain certain essential data, including the photograph of the immigrant. They are issued in duplicate,

such duplicate being permanently filed in the Bureau of Naturalization in Washington.

Without question the identification card is a document of great value to lawfully admitted immigrants. Their possession facilitates naturalization proceedings and otherwise enables the holder to establish his status as a lawful resident. Moreover, the duplicates afford the department a highly valuable and convenient card-index record of aliens who have been admitted for permanent residence.

Finally, it is felt that the issuance of the identification card to arriving immigrants is in strict compliance with section 1 of the naturalization act already referred to. There is ample evidence that the identification cards are appreciated by those to whom they have been issued since the system was inaugurated in July last. This is in part evidenced by the fact that there has been a very considerable demand for similar certificates from immigrants who were admitted prior to July, but no provision has been made for the issuance of documents of any kind in such cases.

The proposed legislation, if enacted, would enable the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, to provide aliens who are lawfully resident in the United States with certificates of admission or residence similar to those now issued to arriving immigrants. As already pointed out, the naturalization law evidently contemplates that some such document shall be issued to arriving aliens, but that having been neglected, some doubt has been raised as to whether the department would be justified under the law in providing every legally resident alien who might apply with a similar document. The proposed legislation, if enacted, would, of course, remove all doubt in this regard and, moreover, would through the charge of \$3 for each certificate issued reimburse the Government, it is believed, for the expense that would necessarily be incurred in putting the proposed system into effect.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, legislation of the character proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] has been heartily recommended by the American Federation of Labor. I read from the proceedings of the Toronto convention, on page 81:

Registration certificates for aliens. The act of June 29, 1906, provided that all immigrants should be registered at port of arrival and be granted certificates of such registration with the particulars thereof. For some reason this law was not enforced until recently. But the United States Immigration Bureau is doubtful as to the legality of the enforcement without further legislation.

It is estimated that there are approximately 1,000,000 aliens in the United States who can not prove their lawful entry.

The Seventieth Congress enacted a law permitting all aliens who entered the United States prior to June 3, 1921, who had no records of their admission, to register and make application for citizenship. Any alien in this country for more than five years before 1924 can not be deported on the ground that he is here unlawfully. But if he came in since July 1, 1924, he can be deported at any time. It is now proposed to enact legislation that will permit those who have no record of their admission voluntarily to ask for registration certificates.

The executive council for a number of years has had this subject under consideration. Under present conditions it is not always possible for the immigration authorities to prove an alien has entered the country unlawfully. Therefore, if every such alien in the United States should be given the privilege of voluntarily registering and obtaining a registration certificate, it would eventually be helpful in discovering new immigrants who have been smuggled in. We, therefore, recommend that the convention approve a measure that will permit all aliens to voluntarily apply for a registration certificate.

The executive council is also firmly of the belief that in order to protect our immigration laws Congress must require the immigration officials to register and give certificates of lawful admission into the United States of all immigrants. If those who are now here would voluntarily register, and all who come hereafter be given registration certificates, it would be possible in a few years to determine which aliens are here unlawfully.

I should like to inquire of the Senator from South Carolina if I am correct in the statement that his bill has been favorably reported to the Senate.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BLEASE. From the Committee on Immigration, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 1278) to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 444) thereon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Arizona I ask that the clerk may read the short report accompanying the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read the report (No. 444) submitted by Mr. BLEASE, as follows:

The Committee on Immigration, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1278) to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes, having had the same under consideration, reports it back to the Senate without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

The bill extends to alien residents the right to apply for a certificate of admission if they so desire, and is the result of a demand on the part of alien residents for some document which they can present as evidence that they are legally resident here in the United States.

It is purely a voluntary matter and not compulsory.

The bill does not provide for registration, as no one can receive a card of identification under its provisions unless he is already registered. There is now a register of every alien who is lawfully and regularly admitted to the United States, and since July 1, 1928, the Immigration Service has issued an engraved certificate of admission to all aliens entering the United States for permanent residence. The purpose of the bill is to provide similar identification for those alien residents who entered the country lawfully prior to July 1, 1928.

Many letters have been received both in favor and in opposition to the bill. The chief objection offered by the opponents apparently comes from a misunderstanding as to the purpose of the bill, believing that it provides compulsory registration or that it will eventually lead to that, while the facts of the matter are that the bill is simply for the issuance of certificates of registration to those who desire same. It does not provide for registration in any manner.

A number of the writers of letters in opposition have apparently looked into the matter since and are now recording themselves as changing their position and favoring the bill.

The committee believes it is not only fair and just that lawfully admitted aliens should have the privilege of securing an identification card if they so desire, but that they are entitled to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, Mexico is the only country of Latin America whose people leave it. All other countries to the south of the Rio Grande encourage immigration. There must be a reason for that. To one who is at all aware of the facts of Mexican history the answer is the unsettled political and economic conditions that have existed in that country, due to revolutionary activities.

Unfortunately for Mexico, the Spanish occupation of the country was not helpful to its inhabitants. The Spaniards controlled Mexico for about three centuries as a colony. The country was exploited at all times for the benefit of Spain. Industry was throttled. Nothing could be manufactured in Mexico that could be made in Spain. Extortionate taxes were levied. Gold and silver in vast quantities were taken back to Spain. No system of public schools was established. Nothing was done to fit the people for self-government. When, through the action of patriotic Mexicans early in the last century, Mexico became free and independent, frankness compels us to say that her people were not fitted to govern themselves. There were frequent changes of administration, one President succeeding another, many revolutions, and, in addition to that, intervention on the part of the French in support of the government of the Emperor Maximilian.

For the information of the Senate, I ask permission to include in the RECORD a letter that I have received from the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress, containing the names and the terms of office of the various persons who have occupied the Presidency of Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Without objection, leave is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,  
Washington, April 14, 1930.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for the names and dates of service of each of the Presidents of Mexico, I forward herewith two photostats, one from the Cambridge Modern History, volume 13, coming down to the end of Diaz's term, and the other from the Mexican Yearbook, covering the period since then.

Very respectfully,

H. H. B. MEYER,  
Director Legislative Reference Service.

#### PRESIDENTS OF MEXICO

(The dates are those of election)

1821 independence declared; Augustin Iturbide generalissimo; 1822 declared himself Emperor and deposed; 1823 dictatorship of Guerrero, Bravo, and Negretti.

Gen. G. Victoria, 1824.

Gen. Guerrero, 1827, Dictator 1829-30.

Gen. Anastasio Bustamente, 1830-1832.

Gen. Pedraza, 1832.

Gen. Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, 1835.

José J. Caro, 1836.

Gen. A. Bustamente, 1837-1840.

Gen. Farias, 1840.

Gen. de Santa Anna, President 1840; Dictator 1841-1844.

Gen. José Joaquín Herrera, ad interim 1844; President 1845.

Gen. Paredes, 1845-46.

Gen. Sales, ad interim 1846-47.

Gen. de Santa Anna, 1847-48.

Gen. Herrera, 1848-1851.

Gen. Mariano Arista, 1851.

M. J. Ceballos, 1852.

Gen. de Santa Anna, Dictator 1853-1855.

Gen. Ignacio Comonfort, ad interim 1855-1858.

Gen. Félix Zuloaga, ad interim 1858.

Gen. Miguel Miramón, 1859.

Gen. Benito Juárez, 1861 (with dictatorial powers).

Maximilian Archduke of Austria, Emperor 1864, executed 1867.

Gen. Benito Juárez, 1867.

Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, 1872.

Porfirio Díaz, 1877-1880.

Manuel Gonzales, 1880-1884.

Porfirio Díaz, 1885-1911.

#### PRESIDENTS

Gen. Porfirio Díaz, December 1, 1910, to May 25, 1911.

Since the overthrow of Díaz, the following have exercised executive power, though frequently their claims to the office have not been admitted by the country generally or recognized by other nations.

Francisco Leon de la Barra, May 25, 1911, to November 10, 1911.

Francisco I. Madero, November 10, 1911, to February 19, 1913.

Pedro Lascurain, from 7 p. m. to 7.46 p. m., February 19, 1913.

Victoriano Huerta, February 19, 1913, to August 13, 1914.

Eulalio Gutierrez, December 13, 1914, to January 25, 1915.

Roque González Garza, January 30, 1915, to May, 1915.

Francisco Lagos Cházaro, July 31, 1915, to October, 1915.

Venustiano Carranza, March 11, 1917; assassinated May 21, 1920.

Adolfo de la Huerta, President ad interim, June 1 to November 30, 1920.

Alvaro Obregón, December 1, 1920-1924.

Plutarco Elías Calles, December 1, 1924-1928.

Emilio Portes Gil, December 1, 1928-

Ortiz Rubio, February 5, 1930-

Mr. HAYDEN. The population of Mexico is now estimated to be about 15,000,000 people. The Commerce Yearbook for 1929 gives the following figures:

Year:	Population of Mexico
1895	12,491,573
1900	13,607,259
1910	15,160,369
1921	14,234,799
1928	15,048,448

It will be noted that the population of Mexico actually decreased during the decade from 1910 to 1921, and that the estimated increase during the succeeding years was very small. It is apparent, therefore, that the large postwar emigration from Mexico was not due to overpopulation, but to the economic situation on both sides of the border.

Improved economic conditions in Mexico will no doubt diminish the pressure of emigration from that country, and may even cause the tide to set in the opposite direction. It is understood that an effort is being made by certain elements in Mexico to encourage citizens of that country who have immigrated into the United States to return to cultivate the land in certain reclamation projects sponsored by the Mexican Government.

Mexico is no inexhaustible source of emigrants. The treatment that we should extend to that country is vastly different from the attitude that America is compelled to assume with respect toward China or India, or even toward Japan. The Statesman's Year-Book, published in London in 1928, gives the population of India, according to the census of 1921, as 247,003,293. The figures for China are difficult to obtain. The editor of the yearbook states that according to the Government Gazette published in 1911 the best estimate was 325,000,000 people. The Chinese Maritime Customs Service issued a statement in 1928 which estimates the population of that Republic as 448,000,000. In the case of Japan, the census of 1925 gives a population of 63,066,595, which does not include the population of the Japanese possessions of Korea and Manchuria.

The effect of removing a million Chinamen from China, or a million Hindus from India, and bringing them to the United States, could not be observed in their mother countries. The removal of a million Mexicans from Mexico, however, as was pointed out by the Senator from Alabama the other day, takes



one-fifteenth of the entire population of that country. The only reason why the Mexican has differed from the Brazilian or the Chilean or the Argentinian in his desire to come to the United States is that his country has not been prosperous, whereas other countries of like resources in South America have enjoyed extraordinary prosperity.

It might be interesting to compare the population of Mexico and that of the Argentine Republic.

We are told by the Statesman's Year-Book that the estimated population of Argentina in 1927 was 10,348,000—an increase of two and one-half million in the past 14 years. There has been an even larger increase, on account of immigration from Europe, in the population of Brazil. I ask leave to insert in the RECORD an extract from the Monthly Labor Review which gives the figures for immigration into Argentina and Brazil during the year 1926.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Monthly Labor Review of June, 1927, p. 212]

#### IMMIGRATION INTO ARGENTINA AND BRAZIL, 1926

A report from the American consul in charge, Digby Willson, at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, dated March 12, 1927, contains a comparison of the immigration into Argentina with that into Brazil during the year 1926.

The following statement, taken from this report, shows the number of immigrants entering Argentina and Brazil, according to nationality:

	Argentina	Brazil
Italians.....	54,800	11,000
Spaniards.....	30,800	9,000
Portuguese.....	2,300	35,000
Germans.....	5,000	7,000
Poles.....	12,800	3,500
Rumanians.....		17,000
Russians.....	930	830
Yugoslavs.....	3,000	3,700
Lithuanians.....	1,300	3,300
French.....	1,210	500
English.....	1,000	500
Czechoslovaks.....	2,330	400
Austrians.....		1,200
Syrians.....		6,500
Japanese.....		15,000
Various.....	11,500	4,500
Total.....	126,970	118,930

Mr. HAYDEN. The Argentine Republic is but little larger in area than Mexico, containing 1,153,000 square miles, whereas the total area of Mexico is 767,000 square miles. The natural resources of the two countries are quite similar. There is no doubt that in time to come each country will support a large population. It is not unreasonable to suppose that within the next century, or, perhaps, less time than that, there will be 50,000,000 people living in Mexico and a like number in the Argentine Republic.

Argentina has advanced economically because a stable government has been maintained in that country. Life and property have been made secure. The country is one to which people from overcrowded Europe are glad to migrate. Let me read from a pamphlet published by the Union of American Republics, which discusses the population of Argentina:

The immigration statistics indicate the character of the population of Argentina, which is to an almost complete extent of European origin. During the past 50 years there settled in the country over 2,000,000 Italians, about 1,150,000 Spaniards, over 200,000 French, about 50,000 English, 70,000 Austro-Hungarians, over 50,000 Germans, 30,000 Swiss, 21,000 Belgians, and of other nationalities sufficient to make all together a total of 4,000,000 or more. Of course, many of these who came years ago have left descendants born in the country and therefore true Argentines, but these figures indicate the racial factors that contribute to the country's population. Immigration is increasing and amounts to several hundred thousand persons a year.

The Argentine Republic has a fine financial standing throughout the world. It is a thoroughly progressive, modern country. Everything that has been accomplished in Argentina can be duplicated in Mexico. All that it would require is a stable government which shall make life and property secure. We have a right, therefore, to look forward to the time when, instead of the Mexicans leaving their homeland, they will remain in Mexico, and emigrants by the thousands will go to that country.

Therefore the situation with which we are now faced is but temporary. It is due to the unfortunate revolutionary conditions which have existed, which have so disturbed the domestic life of the country that Mexicans were compelled to leave for

the United States in order to find a means whereby to sustain themselves.

Nothing of that kind occurred during the years when Mexico was peaceful. The natural resources of the country are so great and so varied that, with a stable government, foreign capital would go into Mexico and help develop the resources of that country, just as foreign capital came to the United States in years past to develop our resources. Every Mexican who so desires will then find employment at home.

Therefore I hope that in the consideration of this measure no Senator will consider the present situation to be permanent, that he will take cognizance of the fact that Mexico has suffered recently from revolutionary troubles, that peace is being established within her borders, and that, once good order is firmly maintained, there will be no reason for Mexicans to emigrate.

As I stated a moment ago, that argument could not possibly apply to Hindus or to the Chinese. The countries from which those people come are tremendously overpopulated. We must set our faces as flint against the admission of people from oriental nations, because there is no limit to the number who could enter this country if the law would permit them to do so, whereas there is a clear and definite limit to the number of Mexicans who would possibly come to the United States. If all of them came, if the whole 15,000,000 Mexicans came, and left their country absolutely vacant, they would not add much more to the population of the United States numerically than are added between one decennial census and another. But if 15,000,000 Chinese or 15,000,000 Hindus came here, they would never be missed from the teeming millions of their own people.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	George	Kendrick	Smoot
Ashurst	Gillett	Keyes	Stock
Barkley	Glass	La Follette	Steiwer
Bingham	Glenn	McKellar	Stephens
Black	Goff	McNary	Sullivan
Blaine	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Swanson
Blease	Gould	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Greene	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Grundy	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Overman	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Patterson	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Heflin	Robison, Ky.	Watson
Deneen	Howell	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Johnson	Shipstead	
Fess	Jones	Shortridge	
Frazier	Kean	Simmons	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let us not forget that the vast area which now comprises the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, and a large part of Colorado, was at one time a part of old Mexico. These territories were annexed to the United States as a result of the Mexican War. The area was inhabited by Mexicans at the time of the annexation and the treaty of peace made at Guadalupe-Hidalgo provided that any of the inhabitants who elected to remain should automatically become citizens of the United States. I read that provision of the treaty, concluded on February 2, 1848, as follows:

ART. 8. Mexicans now established in territories previously belonging to Mexico, and which remain for the future within the limits of the United States, as defined by the present treaty, shall be free to continue where they now reside or to remove at any time to the Mexican Republic, retaining the property which they possess in the said territories, or disposing thereof, and removing the proceeds wherever they please, without their being subjected on this account to any contribution, tax, or charge whatever.

Those who shall prefer to remain in the said territories may either retain the title and rights of Mexican citizens or acquire those of citizens of the United States. But they shall be under the obligation to make their election within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and those who shall remain in the said territories after the expiration of that year, without having declared their intention to retain the character of Mexicans, shall be considered to have elected to become citizens of the United States.

In the said territories property of every kind now belonging to Mexicans not established there shall be inviolably respected. The present

owners, the heirs of these, and all Mexicans who may hereafter acquire said property by contract shall enjoy with respect to it guaranties equally ample as if the same belonged to citizens of the United States.

ART. 9. The Mexicans who, in the territories aforesaid, shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic, conformably with what is stipulated in the preceding article, shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted at the proper time (to be judged of by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution, and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.

Thousands of Mexicans remained in the annexed territory. They became part of the body politic and played a prominent part in the political life of the great Southwest. No better illustration of that fact can be found than to read the names of those who have served in the Congress of the United States from the Territory of New Mexico. Of the Delegates to Congress in Territorial days there were Jose Manuel Gallegos, Miguel A. Otero, Francisco Perea, J. Francisco Chaves, Trinidad Romero, Mariano S. Otero, Tranquilino Luna, Francisco A. Manzanares, and Antonio Joseph, who for five terms represented New Mexico as a Democrat in the House of Representatives. After the admission of New Mexico to Statehood, two Congressmen from New Mexico of Mexican ancestry served in that body, Beinigno C. Hernandez and Nestor Montoya. Many of us in the Senate remember with pleasure our association with that genial and cultured gentleman from New Mexico, Senator Octaviano A. Larrazolo.

I recite these names with which we in Washington should be more or less familiar as illustrative of what has happened throughout the entire Southwest. There has been no discrimination against persons of Mexican blood, the descendants of those who became citizens of the United States at the time of the annexation. They have labored along with the American population which settled in that country for the upbuilding of the entire Southwest. They have been with us always.

It might interest the Senate if I should read an account by a private soldier of the first contact between the armed forces of the United States and the Mexicans during the war with Mexico. I was personally acquainted with the author of the diary which is published in a book entitled "The March of the Mormon Battalion," written by Prof. Frank Alfred Golder, who was at one time a teacher in the State normal school at Tempe, Ariz. The American soldier who wrote the diary was Capt. Henry Standage, whom I remember as an old man. He kept a daily record of the happenings during the famous march of the Mormon battalion from Fort Leavenworth across the continent to San Diego. On December 13, 1846, Mr. Standage made this entry:

This morning I found that one of our pilots—

By that he meant scouts—

had returned from a garrison some 40 miles ahead. The colonel having sent three of them to spy out the route. They went to this town to ascertain whether we could pass through the town to California, it being 100 miles nearer and our provisions short. The pilot said he had not been to the town but that Doctor Foster had gone on. He reported 22 strong and some cannon, and that they could probably raise some 700 or 800 more, swelling their number to 1,000. We traveled 9 miles to-day and camped to prepare for battle, not knowing but we may be met. Twenty-eight rounds of cartridges dealt out to each man and inspection of arms at this place. Battalion drill by the colonel and manuals by our company officers.

14. Reveille at 4 this morning and started very early. I was detailed for a guard this morning. Camped on a small creek, came 20 miles, a distillery here and several Indians. Six Spanish soldiers here and sergeant.

15. Struck tents this morning and resumed our march over a rocky, mountainous, and broken country for 5 miles. At 10 o'clock the colonel took three Spanish soldiers prisoners and sent two of our guides with one Spaniard to the garrison—

It will be noted that he speaks of Mexicans throughout as "Spaniards," which was the common term used among the mountain men of those days—

The Spaniards having detained Doctor Foster a prisoner, we now had three of the Spaniards and in case they should keep our guides we should be even with them. The news brought the colonel by the soldiers was that the Governor of Tucson wished us to pass round the town and not come through, as he could not let us pass through without fighting. Traveled to-day 18 miles and camped without water.

16. During last night's watch some 8 or 10 Spaniards came from the garrison to camp, bringing Doctor Foster with them, our 2

guides also returning with them, the colonel delivering up to them the 3 Spaniards. Doctor Foster informed the colonel that they had plenty of flour, cornmeal, beans, etc., for sale, and that the inhabitants were leaving the town for fear of us coming in contact with the soldiers. He could not say whether the soldiers would defend the town or not. Early this morning the five companies were paraded and marched at a quick pace to Tucson. The colonel determined to pass through. This town is in the north of the district of Sonora in New Mexico. Many of the brethren traveled this 18 miles without either food or drink suffering much for want of water, having none last night or yesterday. When we arrived at the town, we found but a few of the inhabitants, the soldiery having fled with their cannon and also having forced many of the people to leave also. We were kindly treated by the people of Tucson, who brought flour, meal, tobacco, quinces to the camp for sale and many of them giving such things to the soldiers. We camped about one-half mile from town. The colonel suffered no private property to be touched, neither was it in the heart of any man to my knowledge so to do. Two thousand bushels of wheat belonging to the Spanish Government was found out which we were ordered to feed the animals, but none was taken for food for the soldiers as the teams were too weak to haul the same.

17. This morning the colonel concluded to lay by and rest the teams, the men also needing rest very much. Wheat sufficient to do the teams the next 90 miles taken to-day as we now have a desert of that length to cross without either feed or water. The brethren here purchased a little flour, etc., of the Spaniards, some carrying a portion themselves and others putting it into the wagons, unknown to the colonel. Volunteers called for by the colonel to go to the next town and take it; the company being raised, they started but returned, the colonel finding their reinforcements to have been great. Surely the Lord is on our side, for when we see the advantages the Spaniards had in this town, their numbers being far greater than ours, the Cavina also, and in a walled town, well defended against musketry, I am led to exclaim that the Lord God of Israel will save His people, inasmuch as He knoweth the cause of our being here in the United States service.

After the treaty of peace a boundary commission was appointed to define the limits of the two countries. I read from a report of Maj. William H. Emory, who was a member of the boundary commission. In chapter 6 of his report he gives a sketch of the territory acquired under the treaty of December 30, 1853, with Mexico, known as the Gadsden Purchase:

The territory acquired under the treaty of December 30, 1853, lies between the parallels of 31° 20' and 33° 30', and between the meridians of 106° 30' and 104° of longitude measured from Greenwich, and contains 26,185 square miles.

Its eastern part is bounded by the Rio Bravo; its northern by the Rio Gila. The interior of the area is traversed by two rivers, which run northwest and empty into the Gila. These are the San Pedro and the Santa Cruz.

There are within this territory four settlements; one the Mesilla Valley settlement, containing about fifteen hundred inhabitants of the mixed Spanish and Indian races, all engaged in the pursuit of agriculture.

At Tucson there is a settlement consisting of about 70 families, engaged in the same way. South of Tucson there is a small settlement at San Xavier of semicivilized Indians, called Papagos; and further on, at Tomacacori, a small settlement of Germans.

In this same report is a statement by Lieut. N. Michler, who was a subordinate officer to Major Emory. In May, 1855, he visited Tucson and stated:

Several miles before reaching Tucson you strike the bed of the Santa Cruz River, but the stream is subterranean until you reach the town. The latter is inhabited by a few Mexican troops and their families, together with some tame Apache Indians. It is very prettily situated in a fine fertile valley at the base of the Sierra de Santa Catarina. Some fine fields of wheat and corn were ready for the sickle. Many varieties of fruit and all kinds of vegetables were also to be had, upon which we indulged our long-famished appetites. The Apaches, under the direction of the Mexicans, do most of the labor in the fields.

Circumstances were such that my party and escort were compelled to remain encamped near this town for nearly the entire month of June. During this time we became the recipients of every attention and civility from Captain Garcia, who commanded the place, and from his family. We can not find words to express our thanks for their uniform kindness and constant efforts to make the time pass pleasantly.

That statement is but typical of what may be found in all other accounts of the early settlement of the Southwest. There was no bitter friction between the Americans who came into Arizona, New Mexico, west Texas, and California and the natives resident there. They worked together to build up what afterwards became great States in the American Union.

I quote further from the Handbook of Arizona, published in 1858, written by Richard Josiah Hinton:



Bartlett, in his Personal Narrative, published after the Mexican War, but prior to the Gadsden purchase, states that Tucson "has always been, and is to this day, a presidio or garrison, but for which the place could not be sustained. In its best days it boasted a population of a thousand souls, now diminished to about one-third that number."

A few more years and Garcilla, commanding the Presidio, announced to the soldiers drawn up in line the turning over, under the Gadsden purchase, of that portion of the Territory to the United States. On March 10, 1856, all the Mexican authorities and troops evacuated the place. Eleven days previously the first American store in Tucson was started by the arrival of Solomon Warner from Fort Yuma with 13 pack animals loaded with merchandise. Hooper & Hinton, of Fort Yuma, were interested in the adventure.

To further convey the impression to the Senate that we took over a country inhabited by Mexicans I read from a book entitled "On the Border With Crook," written by Capt. John G. Bourke, who describes his experiences in the year 1870:

Tucson was as foreign a town as if it were in Haiti instead of within our own boundaries. The language, dress, funeral processions, religious ceremonies, feasts, dances, games, joys, perils, griefs, and tribulations of its population were something not to be looked for in the region east of the Missouri River.

My father, Charles Trumbull Hayden, a native of Connecticut, came to the Southwest in 1849. He had been in business in Independence, Mo., a favorite trading post for the West. When he heard of the discovery of gold in California he loaded his entire stock of goods into wagons and with ox teams crossed the plains over the trail to Santa Fe, N. Mex. He found Santa Fe a Spanish-speaking community; it was so thoroughly Mexican that it was necessary for him to acquire a knowledge of the Spanish language in order to engage in business.

Shortly after the Gadsden purchase my father moved to Tucson, in southern Arizona, where he lived for a number of years. At one time during the Civil War he was the only representative of Federal authority in southern Arizona. He found the place a small Mexican town with Mexican customs and Mexican ways of doing business. The stores were closed at noon so that everyone might take a siesta.

To-day there are ten times as many people in Arizona of Mexican blood as there were at the time of the annexation. The estimate of Professor Garis, in the Saturday Evening Post, from which I have read, is that there are about 60,000 people of Mexican blood in Arizona. I do not know whether or not that number is correct, but we will soon ascertain the facts as a result of the count now being taken by the Bureau of the Census.

It is fair to say, however, that Mexicans compose from one-fifth to one-seventh of the population of Arizona. So many thousands of Americans have moved into Arizona and into the Southwest generally that Mexicans are no longer a controlling element of the population. From the very beginning they have furnished the common labor on our farms and in our mines. For over 70 years they have done that character of work throughout Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. The Mexican presents no new problem in those regions.

Every Mexican living in Arizona to-day is better clothed, better fed, and better cared for in every respect than if that State had remained a part of old Mexico. The Mexican becomes a problem when he leaves the border. In recent years they have been carried first as section hands for the railroads into Missouri and Iowa and Illinois, and from there penetrating farther into the east. Now we are told that Mexicans are employed in the steel mills about Pittsburgh and in Michigan and in the beet-sugar industry, and that Mexicans are scattered in practically every State in the Union. Until the last few years, however, no such general contact with the Mexicans had existed. It is not surprising that Americans residing in the East, who are wholly unacquainted with Mexicans, should bitterly resent their coming as aliens. That state of mind did not exist among the people of the Southwest, where Mexicans resided before any Americans ever came to that section of the country.

Most of the Mexicans who enter the United States are Indians. From a book entitled "The Republic of Mexico," one of a series of handbooks of the library of Latin America information, we learn that of the total population of Mexico, 38 per cent are of Indian blood, 19 per cent white, and 43 per cent mixed. The principal tribes of Indians in Mexico are as follows:

Nahuatlan	1,750,000
Otomia	700,000
Zapotec	580,000
Maya	400,000
Tarascan	250,000

There are as many distinct tribes of Indians in Mexico as there were originally in the United States. They differ from one another as do Indians in the United States. There is just

as much difference between the various tribes of Indians of Mexico as there is between the Iroquois of New York and the Cherokees of North Carolina, the Seminoles of Florida and the Shawnees of Ohio, the Sioux and the Pueblo Indians of the Southwest, the Osage and the Papago, and the Crow and the Paiute.

One of the best tribes in all Mexico, so far as courage and manhood are concerned, are the Yaqui Indians, who live in the State of Sonora. The Yaqui is a first-class fighting man. His country, on the Yaqui River, is dear to him, and when, under the old régime in Mexico, an effort was made to seize his lands and drive him away from them the Yaqui resisted. All that he asked was what has been granted to our Indians in the United States—a reservation, a home of his own. When the Mexican Government would not provide that for him he fought that Government valiantly. I can remember as a boy talking with Yaqui Indians employed in the Salt River Valley, Ariz., who freely confessed that their purpose in coming to the United States to obtain work for wages was to earn sufficient money with which to purchase Winchester rifles and cartridges and to go back to Mexico again to fight for the control of their homes.

Yaquis, as fighting men, are responsible for the large place that the State of Sonora now occupies in the Government of Mexico. Sonora is a small and thinly populated State in one corner of that great Republic. A comparable situation in America would be that the State of Wyoming provided the President and a large number of the Cabinet officials and that a group of citizens of Wyoming were in actual control of the American Government.

That is what has happened in recent years in Mexico. President Obregon was a citizen of Sonora; his successor, President Calles, was a citizen of Sonora; but it was the fighting Yaqui Indian who made that possible. They were the only soldiers, to my knowledge, in all the revolutions in Mexico who had the courage to attack breastworks defended by barbed wire and machine guns. To-day they form the bodyguard of the President of Mexico. It is the fighting Yaqui who has established the government that now exists in Mexico.

A good soldier is a good workingman, and, Mr. President, if you should inquire of any farmer in Arizona he will tell you that he is glad to employ Yaqui Indians. They are sober, industrious, truthful, and reliable. They are the best agricultural labor from Mexico that comes to Arizona.

It is always interesting to speak of the success that came to one Indian in Mexico, who became the President of that Republic. I refer to Benito Pablo Juárez, a full-blooded Zapotec Indian. Unknown except as a country lawyer in his native State of Oaxaca until after he was 40 years of age, he became judge of the civil court, governor of his State, chief justice of Mexico, and finally its President. A pure Indian, without a drop of white blood in his veins, he was a just judge and able administrator, a man of absolute honesty and untiring industry. He rose from a humble origin to the greatest eminence. His resistance to the French invaders was persistent and stubborn. Juárez never was a soldier; he was known among Mexicans as "the man in the black coat." He gave peace and order to Mexico, being the first President who was able to do that from the beginning of the independence of that country in 1821. There has been erected a monument to him in the city of Vera Cruz, upon the base of which is engraved one of his wise sayings, "Respect for the rights of others is peace." Benito Juárez served the people of Mexico faithfully and well; he was a credit to his race, which, as I have already said, was pure Mexican Indian.

One other great President of Mexico also had Indian blood in his veins—Porfirio Díaz. His grandmother was a pure-blood Indian. Anyone who ever saw President Díaz would not fail to recognize his Indian blood. For 35 years he controlled the destinies of that republic.

There was peace in Mexico during the entire Díaz régime. It was the peace of the sword; he put the fear of death into all revolutionists, but there was peace. One could go from one limit of the Republic to the other, absolutely unarmed and unafraid. It was only in his old age, when he and those who were associated with him no longer had the vigor to carry on the kind of government which they had instituted, that it fell to pieces as a house of cards.

The great fault of the Díaz administration in Mexico was the failure to provide during its 35 years for a system of common schools for the education of the people; another great fault was the failure to provide a means whereby the ordinary Mexican citizen might acquire a homestead and have a stake in the land. If we had had the same kind of homestead laws on this side of the Rio Grande that they have had in Mexico, I doubt not but that we would have had as many revolutions in the United

States as have occurred in Mexico. Nothing ties a people to their government like ownership of the soil.

I have never blamed any Mexican, ill-paid, ill-fed, and ill-clothed, for joining a revolution, when some revolutionary leader came to him with a Mauser rifle and belt of cartridges and offered an opportunity to loot stores, to kill cattle, and actually to have more to eat than he ever had before in his life. How can one blame an individual in those circumstances for engaging in revolutionary activities? It is but natural that revolutions should take place where such conditions prevail.

I am happy to say that revolutions in Mexico have apparently worn themselves out. The country has arrived at a time when peace may be considered to have been permanently established. That being so, there will be less and less reason for Mexicans to come to the United States.

Much has been published in American magazines to prejudice the American people against the Mexican people. I have here a copy of a magazine entitled "Eugenics, a Journal of Race Betterment," published in January, 1929—an immigration number—in which is an article by C. M. Goethe, entitled "The Influx of Mexican Amerinds."

Mr. Goethe goes on to explain that the word "Amerind" is made up of the two words "American Indian"; but to attach a name of that kind to a Mexican coming to the United States has no other purpose than to create prejudice against him. When a Mexican laborer enters the United States he becomes an "Amerind," an unwanted and much misunderstood individual, whenever he leaves the border.

Why is it that there is so much sympathy for the Indians of the United States, and so little sympathy for the Indians of Mexico? We have in this country great organizations like the Indian Rights Association, established more than a generation ago, which now numbers in its membership, as shown upon this letterhead, such eminent names as Dr. Felix Adler, Irvin S. Cobb, Hon. John W. Davis, Dr. David Starr Jordan, Hon. Gifford Pinchot, Kermit Roosevelt, William Allen White, and Owen Wister. The chief concern of this great organization is the welfare of the American Indian. Years of service have been devoted by its members to that worthy object. More recently there has been established the American Indian Defense Association, on whose letterhead as sponsors for it appear the names of Mrs. Mary Austin, Irvin Batcheller, Adolph Lewisohn, George Foster Peabody, Hamlin Garland, Murray Hulbert, and many other eminent Americans.

There are in this country many, many people keenly interested in the welfare of the American Indian. Through organizations of the kind that I have mentioned they have done much to improve the conditions of the American Indian, but when an Indian of the same type, of the same character, of the same blood, no different in all of his ethnologic background than an American Indian, comes across the border from Mexico, then there is no comfort and no charity for him which is a most inconsistent course for many Americans to pursue.

We are told that in Virginia there are families who take pride in tracing their descent to the Indian princess Pocahontas. I served in the House of Representatives with a very able and a very distinguished man who long represented the State of Oklahoma, Hon. Charles D. Carter, who took great pride in his Indian blood. As Senator from that same State was Hon. Robert L. Owen, who was a member of the Cherokee Tribe.

We have in the person of our own beloved Vice President one who is indeed proud of his American Indian ancestry. I know that he and all others who are Christian people, anxious to see justice done to any race who happen to be among us against whom discrimination is practiced, would not countenance the treatment that has been given to Mexican Indians when they cross our border and enter the United States seeking employment.

The time has come when we should realize that Mexico is our neighbor; that the ties that bind the two countries together are growing closer and closer every day. First by the railroad, then by the automobile highway, and now by airplane, Mexico is brought nearer and nearer to the United States day by day. They are our neighbors upon the south, just as Canada is our neighbor upon the north; and they are entitled to preferential treatment because they are our neighbors.

If you live in the same block with a man, if his house and lot adjoin your property, in the very nature of things you must have a closer relationship with him than with some one who lives in a more distant part of the city. You are more considerate of your neighbor's feelings; you are careful in any action you may take not to offend him, because he lives near to you. He is not only here to-day but he is to be there tomorrow, and for the years to come. So it is with Mexico.

Therefore I plead with the Senate, in the consideration of any legislation, whatever it may be, that it be done in a spirit of fairness, in a spirit of justice, and that no action be taken so far as Mexico is concerned which does not apply equally to every other nation in the world. That proposition is fundamental.

There is one other fundamental principle to which I strictly adhere. I believe that no large number of aliens should be permitted to become permanent residents of the United States whose children will not look the same, act the same, and have the same ideals, as other Americans. The Americans who are now here have the undisputed right to insist that the United States shall continue to be populated by our own kind of people.

I firmly believe in that principle. That is why I have voted for every act to restrict undesirable immigration, beginning with the passage of the bill imposing a literacy test over the veto of President Wilson, and ending with the defeat of the bill to repeal the national-origins provision of the immigration law as requested last year by President Hoover. I have no apology to make for supporting legislation of that character. I am not here now, and shall not, by any act or vote of mine interfere with the principle thus laid down. All that I do say to the Senate, my sole plea, is, if changes are to be made in the existing immigration laws, let the changes apply to all countries equally and alike.

Mr. ALLEN obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	George	Kendrick	Smoot
Ashurst	Gillett	Keyes	Steck
Barkley	Glass	La Follette	Stelwer
Bingham	Glenn	McKellar	Stephens
Black	Goff	McNary	Sullivan
Blaine	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Swanson
Blease	Gould	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	Greene	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brock	Grundy	Nye	Townsend
Brookhart	Hale	Overman	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Patterson	Tydings
Capper	Harrison	Phipps	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Wagner
Connally	Hawes	Pittman	Walcott
Copeland	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hebert	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Heflin	Robison, Ky.	Watson
Deneen	Howell	Sheppard	Wheeler
Dill	Johnson	Shipstead	
Fess	Jones	Shortridge	
Frazier	Kean	Simmons	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Gould amendment and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. ALLEN. This is a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Kansas offers the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]:

That section 6 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended by section 3 of joint resolution approved May 29, 1928, be amended to read as follows:

"(a) Immigration visas to quota immigrants shall be issued in each fiscal year as follows:

"(1) Fifty per cent of the quota of each nationality for such year shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to quota immigrants who are the fathers or the mothers, or the husbands by marriage occurring after May 31, 1928, of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over.

"(2) Any portion of such 50 per cent not required in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to the classes specified in paragraph (1) shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to quota immigrants of such nationality who are the unmarried children under 21 years of age, or the wives, of alien residents of the United States who are lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(3) No portion of the quota of any nationality for any year not required for the issuance of immigration visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to other quota immigrants of such nationality unless authorized by the Secretary of Labor, and then only



to such extent and in such classes of cases as are specified by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor and approved by the Secretaries of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, jointly.

"(4) No alien shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant under section 4 (c) unless he is of a class of relatives described in paragraphs (1) and (2) hereof, or unless his admission be permitted by regulations authorized under paragraph (3), but the total number of immigrants admitted under section 4 (c) in any fiscal year shall not exceed 75,000.

"(b) The preference provided in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subdivision (a) shall, in the case of quota immigrants of any nationality, be given in the calendar month in which the right to preference is established; if the number of immigration visas which may be issued in such month to quota immigrants of such nationality has not already been issued; otherwise, in the next calendar month."

SEC. 2. Section 11 of such act, as amended, is amended by adding after subdivision (g) thereof the following new subdivision:

"(h) Not more than 1 per cent of the total number of immigration visas which may be issued in any fiscal year to quota immigrants of any nationality shall be issued in such year to quota immigrants of such nationality who were born in the colonies, dependencies, or protectorates of the country by which such nationality is determined; except that in the case of any nationality the quota for which is less than 10,000 the above maximum shall be 100 instead of such 1 per cent."

SEC. 3. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 1930.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is in order, but the first vote will be taken on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kansas if he will not yield so that I may ask unanimous consent that beginning to-morrow at 12 o'clock no Senator shall speak more than 10 minutes on the bill or on any amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. HARRIS. I submit that request.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would have to object to that. I may not have heard the request aright, but, as I understand it, the Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent that after 12 o'clock to-morrow there shall be a limitation of debate to 10 minutes on the bill or any amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I will make it longer than that if the Senator prefers. Let us make it 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think that at this time a limitation should not be imposed. It may be that I shall not desire to speak at all, but all of the time thus far has been taken by one Member of the Senate. He has spoken for practically seven hours upon the bill. I do not think it would be entirely just to limit every Senator now to 10 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the Senator agree to a limitation of 20 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we should not put a limitation on debate at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think I can shorten this when I say to the Senator that I could not agree to any limitation to-day. I want to make some remarks. If I can get the floor when the Senator from Kansas concludes, I shall make them this afternoon, but they will take more than 20 minutes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I suggest to the Senator from Georgia that he defer his request until some time to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. I will wait until to-morrow.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I would like to know what is pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia to the pending bill, on page 2, line 6, to strike out "April" and to insert in lieu thereof "June."

Mr. BLACK. Then the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas is not pending at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order, but the vote comes first on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, this is a very simple provision to accomplish a very profound purpose in the policy of immigration in this country. It would give to the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce the power under the present quotas to select immigration according to the classes needed at a particular period.

This establishes for the immigration policy in the United States a situation similar to what is done, for example, through the policy of the order in council in Canada. It does what the

Board of Trade of Great Britain does. The parliaments establish the metes and bounds under which these official bureaus make the selectivity of immigration.

This amendment meets the problem of the Senator from Georgia in that it gives to the Secretary of Labor and his associates in the Cabinet the power to choose at any time according to the needs of the period Mexican immigration, and to establish the rules under which it shall be brought in, and under which it shall be returned, if necessary.

It solves the problem of seasonal labor for the Senator from Wyoming in that it provides that there can be brought in from Mexico at any time upon proof of the need whatever labor is necessary.

In fact it establishes for all time in this country that hereafter immigration into the United States, not only from the quota countries but from the nonquota countries, shall be limited under the quotas according to the needs and to the classes, the problem of administration resting within the judgment of the Secretary of Labor and his associates in the Cabinet.

Mr. President, it is the first time we have attempted in this country—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator if the provisions of his amendment would be applied to Canada?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; it applies to Canada. It applies alike to the quota and to the nonquota countries. As to Canada it merely provides that the Secretary of Labor and the Cabinet officers associated with him in this matter shall choose from Canada such labor as the needs of any period or any class require.

While I realize that it is a large grant of power, of discretionary power perhaps, to the members of the Cabinet, and especially to the Secretary of Labor, I believe that in the designation of the four Cabinet members we have provided the wise checks and balances against any abuse of such discretionary power. For example, it is not likely that the Secretary of Labor would permit into this country an influx of labor from Canada or an influx of labor from Mexico or from any other of the countries of the world that would seriously affect the present situation in labor. I dare say that at this hour, if this were enacted into law, we would not be receiving from any quota country any of the labor that is now competing for the jobs in the United States during this period of unemployment.

This amendment provides that the Secretary of State must be satisfied with the rules, and he is jealous, of course, of the effect which the attitude of this country toward our neighbor countries may have in our relations of diplomacy. It provides that the Secretary of Commerce must be satisfied, and it is his jealous concern that nothing shall be done in relation to immigration that injures commerce. It provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied, and his jealous concern is that no limitation be placed or provision made concerning immigration that shall affect agriculture in an unfortunate way.

Mr. President, in this country our immigration system has grown up somewhat like Topsy. We began with the system which allowed countries to dump their aliens almost without restriction.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will it disturb the Senator if I ask him a question at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VANDENBERG in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. ALLEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thought possibly from the Senator's remarks that he was about to come now to the general question. May I ask him to explain a little more in detail as to the maximum number and the possible application of his amendment to the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the amendment provides that the Secretary of Labor and his associates in the Cabinet shall limit admission from the countries of the Western Hemisphere to 75,000 per annum. I am not very particular about that provision. It was put in there because it was suggested that without some limitation there might be a constitutional objection to the granting of so much legislative power to the Secretary of Labor and his associates. But the provision for 75,000 allows about the same number as is provided by the House bill of Representative JOHNSON, to which the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD] applies. He provides about 76,000. My amendment limits the entire number to 75,000 for the Western Hemisphere. It gets away from the objection of the quota.

I have a good deal of sympathy with the objection raised by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM]. While I realize that the highest privilege that any country may possess is that of establishing its own standard of living and of protecting that standard of life by its immigration laws, yet I realize also that at this time we ought to have a decent regard for neighborly associations. My amendment, by failing to draw comparisons, by failing to set aside quotas, by merely establishing this blanket limitation, I think, is subject to less objection from the standpoint of the Senator from Connecticut than anything that might be offered.

Is there further question the Senator from California wishes on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON. Taking specific figures, there came from Canada last year approximately 57,000 to 60,000 people. That would leave a reservoir of 15,000 to 18,000 for all of Latin America and for Mexico; that is, if the number were recognized as coming from Canada that might be permitted to come into this country.

Mr. ALLEN. That is true. If in the judgment of the Senator 75,000 is not enough, I would be glad to have it increased. The thought was that we would admit from Canada at any time all that a reasonable interpretation of possible emergency might lead us to accept. It would give us the privilege of admitting from Mexico 10,000 to 12,000 a year. The immigration from other countries of the Western Hemisphere has been notably light so that it has not been necessary to take it into consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON. My interest primarily is in the Mexican immigration, because that is the immigration which has accomplished the purposes that we would rather see remedied, I think. We have 75,000 then coming from the other countries of the world?

Mr. ALLEN. We have coming from the other countries of the world 150,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; at the present time. The Senator would add the 75,000 from the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; to the 150,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. The 75,000, of course, under the Senator's amendment, would be selected as he has indicated by the commission he has designated. Does the selectivity under his amendment extend to those who come in under the quota?

Mr. ALLEN. Exactly; in precisely the same way.

Mr. JOHNSON. So that the 150,000 who would come from the other countries of the world would be subject to exactly the same rules as the 75,000 provided for coming from the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. ALLEN. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. And the selectivity of those coming from the Old World, if I may so designate it, would rest entirely with the commission—a very radical departure from the present quota system.

Mr. ALLEN. It is a very radical departure, Mr. President, in that it establishes the first effort of this country to place immigration upon a basis of scientific selectivity, giving to the Government the power to choose under its own rules according to the needs, the employments, and the economic justifications of any period.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is an absolute destruction of the quota theory—that is, the theory which has been in vogue up to this time.

Mr. ALLEN. It establishes the quota as the metes and bounds under which the commission may act.

Mr. JOHNSON. Purely as to numbers?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. On the question of selectivity, is the selective class to be determined here by the board?

Mr. ALLEN. The board is to have the power to establish the administrative rules and to pass its administrative commands to the elements of our foreign services according to its judgment. I have not thought that it was worth while for us to try to prescribe in a law the regulations under which the selectivity might be administered, but to leave to the board, composed of the Secretaries who have close contact with foreign services, the task of making a system which will work. I believe, if the Senator will pardon me, that the figures which have been presented in the last few days touching Mexican immigration, the showing that it has come from 5,000 a month in round numbers down to 1,100 a month due to the more strict administration of rules under the more strict administration here are illustrative of what might be done.

Mr. JOHNSON. I beg the Senator not to fall into error by the number of visas which have been accorded to Mexicans who came into this country. That number of visas by no means indicates the number of Mexicans who have come across the border. As a matter of fact, it is conceded that the number has increased

notwithstanding the fact that few have obtained visas. That is the unfortunate thing into which we have run—I do not want to unduly interrupt the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I am glad to have the Senator's ideas and suggestions.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is the unfortunate thing into which we have run under Mexican immigration. It comes across the border. It will not concern itself with the visa. I instanced yesterday to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] the fact that four or five or six years ago we put a head tax of \$18 upon each Mexican who came across. In the year preceding that \$7,000 came across the border. In the year that we put the tax upon them 32,000 came across the border. Yet it is admitted on all hands that when the 32,000 came across the border enough additional came across the border to more than equal the 87,000 of the previous year.

We had the remarkable spectacle presented when the tax was in effect of having the United States Government go, for instance, into the Imperial Valley, and there endeavor to collect that tax in installments from employers of the Mexican labor who had come across the border without paying the tax. I beg of the Senator not to be misled by the visa figures, because they do not demonstrate the facts.

I want to return to the question of selectivity, with the Senator's permission. Does the Senator believe that a board sitting in Washington can accurately select the appropriate kind of immigrants from across the water under a mere system of bureaucracy? Must not that selectivity, to be of any value at all, be made at the sources?

Mr. ALLEN. I take for granted, of course, that the board, in the interest of more intelligent administration, would make the most accurate and thorough use of all the elements of the Foreign Service. I had rather trust the Foreign Service on this subject, to be administered here, than to trust loosely the individual, unchecked judgment of consuls and consular agents around the world, left free to use as absolute authority. My position is that that service shall be tightened up. There shall be a constant study—and, of course, first-hand study—of the foreign sources of our immigration through these agencies. The two of them working together in the spirit of the law to provide selectivity will obtain a better result than that which we now have.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator may be right. I am so much interested in this matter—

Mr. ALLEN. I am very glad to have the Senator's suggestions.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator presents an idea that has often been suggested in reference to immigration, but which never before has been presented concretely—legislatively. It is a suggestion which, in my opinion, requires the best thought that is among us.

Let us take as an example the Mexican situation. Here sits the board in Washington. It decrees upon the evidence that shall have been presented to it that 60,000 Mexicans are required in the sugar-beet fields, for agricultural pursuits, upon the railroads, and the like. Then it would have the power to say that the emigration from Mexico would be 60,000 in that year, would it not?

Mr. ALLEN. It would; and to prescribe the manner in which they should be brought in, the sections to which they should be distributed, and other details of administration.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now, let me point out to the Senator—and then I shall cease my catechism—that there is the danger of what he suggests, because all of us who come from the West and are familiar with the situation know that our agriculturists, including the beet-sugar growers, our railroads, and others who use Mexican labor, can make an impregnable case from their standpoint for the use of that Mexican labor. The only way in which the problem of preventing this influx can be met is not by permitting a board to determine whether or not the need exists—for those interested will prove that fact—but by preventing them from coming at all except in a limited, definite, absolute number. I submit that suggestion for the consideration of the Senator.

Mr. ALLEN. I am very much interested in what the Senator from California has said, and I realize the difficulties. I realize moreover, as I dare say he does, that this proposal does nothing to make any looser or more indefinite the situation that now exists. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think that that is probably accurate except in one particular, and that is that it intrusts to individuals not only the administration of the law but it intrusts to them the making of the law in regard to the number which shall come from certain territory, and that has not been the purpose of our immigration laws heretofore.



Mr. ALLEN. The making of the ordinances that will govern the number?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. And the regulations?

Mr. JOHNSON. The Senator's proposal would permit the board to determine that fact.

Mr. ALLEN. May I ask the Senator if he can suggest a better source of selective power than these four members of the Cabinet, each with a jealous regard for his particular angle as affected by immigration?

Mr. JOHNSON. And none of whom would I criticize in the slightest degree.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think that probably I could select no better board, but the objection to that in my mind—tentative only, I will say to the Senator—is lodging in any board the power to say, "There shall be allowed to enter the United States forty, fifty, or sixty thousand immigrants from Mexico," and letting the board then permit them to come. I think Congress should definitely fix the number, just as we have done with foreign countries across the water in the Old World. We have said to them, "You shall have a certain percentage that aggregates in the total 150,000 or thereabouts." Now, it is proposed entirely to change that method.

Mr. ALLEN. May I ask of the Senator, does he believe that at this hour it would be beneficial if a board existed with the power to limit immigration under the present quotas in view of conditions of unemployment in the United States?

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator mean to limit it below what we have fixed as the standard?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; to limit it to actual necessities, or to shut it out altogether so far as any class might be concerned on which at the moment there is a surplus.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am by no means clear as to that. Does the Senator mean to allow a board to act under a sliding scale?

Mr. ALLEN. We could establish a board—and that is what is proposed in this amendment—a part of whose very serious business would be the constant study of population levels in this country, of employment levels, of unusual conditions, of the special needs of the particular hour, and in view of the conditions discovered to fit the allowances under the quota into a process of selectivity. For instance, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is concerned just now about rayon workers. Under the present quota law it is necessary to secure a new permit every six months in order that some 300 people from Holland—or 600 or whatever the number may be—may stay on and work in the rayon factories. Under the power proposed to be granted by the amendment the Secretary of Labor and his associates in the Cabinet would be allowed to charge such rayon workers to the quota from Holland. The problem would be solved, and with a more accurate and direct knowledge of the situation, with a more precise movement of administration, than is possible under the present law.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator construe the power of the board to be such that it could substantially prevent any immigration?

Mr. ALLEN. I construe the power of the board to be such that if the emergency existed which made it an unwise public policy for any immigration to come into this country they would have the power to shut it out.

Mr. JOHNSON. So that if to-day, for instance, in the unemployment situation which presents itself the board should conclude that we should have no immigration quotas, then we would have none if they so determined?

Mr. ALLEN. If they so determined then the quota would be suspended for the period.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the Senator what is the total number of immigrants that could come into this country in a year under his amendment?

Mr. ALLEN. The total number that could come into this country under the amendment would be from the established quota countries 150,000, and from the Western Hemisphere 75,000 more, or 225,000 in all.

Mr. President, during all the time in which this great country has struggled with the problem of immigration we have had few regulations; the mere restriction of numbers came to be the first serious effort we made at regulation. We used to enrich the shipping companies by letting the captains and officers of shipping companies themselves be the censors upon the character of the immigration, and as late as 1921 there came into this country nearly 900,000 aliens in one year. Under the present law the number has been reduced to 150,000; under

my proposal we would take possession of the situation and make it what the ever-changing condition of this country decrees that it should be.

Mr. President, every country that has taken scientific control of its immigration has done this thing. England does it in the case of immigration, and she does it moreover in the case of emigration, because emigration is a greater problem in England than is immigration. So, at an expense of \$15,000,000 a year, England carries on a constant activity in the matter of selecting and training for emigration. She chooses with great care the emigrants who shall go out of the mother country to British colonies; she coordinates with all of the British colonies; and I fear on many occasions those which are left for us are the culls after England and her colonies have gone through the process of selecting emigration for the colonies. If Great Britain successfully does this in reference to emigration, she can also do it, and so can we, in reference to immigration.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I will state to the Senator that the policy of nearly all the countries of the world, except ours, is to send as emigrants people who are diseased, people who are less able to make their living in the countries to which they immigrate. That was their policy down to the year 1921.

Mr. ALLEN. Exactly; and we coordinated in that policy by making the United States a dumping ground; and now we are shuddering a bit at the idea of establishing a strong administrative provision to give ourselves the right to choose who shall come into this country at whatever hour we desire them to come. No higher privilege exists in all the world than the privilege of a great nation to establish its own standards of living and to protect those standards by its immigration laws.

In Canada they have what they call their "order in council." If American emigrants desire to go to Canada, and to present themselves for admittance into the Dominion, they must first receive the approval of the governor in council, with his associates in the Government, and they choose, according to the metes and bounds established by their Parliament, the number that shall come in. I am merely asking that in this country we erect reasonable and elastic bounds, to be presided over by our own dependable officers.

There is another provision in the amendment, Mr. President, in line 13, that meets a provision in the bill pending in the House, which is known as the Johnson bill, for which this amendment is proposed as a substitute. I refer to the provision that not more than 1 per cent of any quota allowed to a foreign country shall be used by the colonial representatives of that country. That is designed to meet the situation that is developing from Jamaica and other British colonies in the West Indies, where the citizens are subject to the use of Great Britain's quota for entrance into the United States.

There is another provision that 50 per cent of the quotas shall be consumed, if necessary, by the relatives, and, if more than 50 per cent is needed for the use of relatives, that that also shall be extended, and, if less than 50 per cent is needed, then the remainder shall be used for occupational immigration. That, Mr. President, would establish a further restriction upon our immigration, in that it would encourage the uniting of families from southern Europe, whence many immigrants come with no intention to bring their families. This amendment leaves no other reasonable course open to them than to bring their families along, and in that way it becomes indirectly, of course, a further limitation on immigration.

I have had the bill studied by the experts on immigration in the Department of Labor. I asked them if they would give me an expert opinion as to the influence of this particular section, which is in many respects one of the most important features of the measure, outside of the great powers it will give to the board. The expression of the experts was that under the proposed bill certain relatives of United States citizens and the wives and minor children of lawfully resident aliens, to the extent of 50 per cent of the established quotas would have the privilege of joining their relatives in the United States. In the case of nationalities having quotas of not less than 300, the same 50 per cent of the quotas would be open to persons skilled in agriculture on equal terms with relatives of citizens and lawfully resident aliens. The remaining 50 per cent of the quotas and such parts of the first 50 per cent as are not used in issuing quota visas to relatives and persons skilled in agriculture would be put under the control of the Secretary of Labor to be administered under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretaries of State, Agriculture, and Commerce. Such regulations might be so drawn as to permit the Secretary of Labor to authorize the admission of additional relatives, pro-

vided the 50 per cent of the quotas specifically allotted to them was not sufficient to take care of appealing cases. On the other hand, such regulations might be drawn to provide that no immigrants except the relatives named could be admitted, or that immigration visas would be issued only to such aliens as are actually needed in the United States on a selective basis.

The probable results of the proposed legislation would be that in the case of nationalities where the relatives of residents named exceed the entire available quota, future immigration from such countries would be practically devoted to reuniting families. This would very likely occur in connection with the quotas of the following nationalities in which preferences for relatives, already authorized, are sufficient to exhaust the available quotas for from 1 to 15 years. These countries are: Albania, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, Syria, Turkey, and Yugoslavia.

On the other hand, the demand for preference visas for relatives is quite limited in Great Britain, Irish Free State, Germany, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, France, Belgium, the Netherlands.

Consequently, it would follow that practically the entire quotas of the last-named countries would be open to administrative control on a purely selective basis.

Under the proposed bill the same plan would be operative in the case of immigration from Canada, Mexico, and other New World countries, except that there would be no quota limitation to the number of natives of such countries who might be admitted as relatives or under the selective plan.

Under the present system, nearly all of the quota allotments of the principal northwestern European countries are open to immigrants with no near relatives in the United States, and who come here to gain a livelihood chiefly in American industries. With the exception of applicants who may be skilled in agriculture, visas are issued on the principle of "first come, first served"; and the important question of whether such workers are needed in this country or whether they are coming to already overcrowded occupations, as is usually the case, is not taken into consideration.

Mr. President, it is my belief that if we adopt this amendment, we shall, for the first time in the history of this country, place the immigration policy of the land in the hands that would safeguard it properly, with the intention of working no injustice on any country or on any man, with the intention of recognizing the need of seasonal employment, with the intention of bringing up, by this scientific selectivity, the grade and quality of the classes admitted for immigration into this country.

#### MUSCLE SHOALS—CHESTER H. GRAY

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, when we had the Muscle Shoals joint resolution before the Senate I made some comments about the lobbying activities of Chester Gray, the Washington representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I made some comments along the same line when we had the Muscle Shoals bill before us a couple of years before. I stated at that time that my remarks in regard to Chester Gray were not at all exhaustive; that later on, if any attempt were made to get the so-called cyanamid bid before the Senate, or if any attempt were made to dispute the facts as brought out by the various committees of the Senate in regard to the dishonorable activities of Chester Gray, I might have something further to say.

What I am saying to-day is brought out by the fact that Mr. Thompson, the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has undertaken in a public way to defend the activities of Mr. Gray; so I am going to give to the Senate a little more of the evidence in regard to this man's work before Congress.

I am not going to go into an exhaustive discussion of it to-day. I shall have reserved several more chapters if a further attempt is made to defend him for what I believe to be the unwarranted and disgraceful conduct that he has exhibited as the representative of a great farm organization, whose members, I take it, scattered all over the United States, are honest and moved by a sincere and laudable purpose of bettering agriculture and those engaged in agriculture, and who do not really know how they have been misrepresented before the American Congress by Mr. Gray.

I am moved somewhat, in what I say to-day, by what is more or less a personal attack made upon me by Mr. Thompson, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in his attempts to defend Mr. Gray. He has written a letter that was published by the American Farm Bureau Federation, circulated all over the United States, and sent particularly in large quantities into my own State, where I presume the in-

tention is to have some effect upon my official duties here by building a fire, as it were, in the short-grass country of the West.

Mr. Thompson says in his letter that I have charged Chester Gray, legislative representative of the Farm Bureau, with being a traitor to the cause of agriculture and that I demanded that the Farm Bureau repudiate him. I do not think I called Mr. Gray a traitor; but I have no fault to find with the use of that term if Mr. Thompson wants to apply it and thinks what I have said about Mr. Gray makes a traitor of him. I did not use any such harsh word as that.

Mr. Thompson said that I had made two charges against Mr. Gray: First, that he supported the American Cyanamid Co. bid for Muscle Shoals; second, that Chester Gray during the recent tariff fight sat by, seeing the farmer flimflammed from morning until night, without raising his voice in protest.

Why, Mr. Thompson did not get the most serious charge I made against Mr. Gray. It is true that I said he supported the Cyanamid Co., and devoted his time to power companies and the Cyanamid Co. at the sacrifice of performing his duties for the benefit of agriculture; but he has a right, Mr. Thompson has a right, and the Farm Bureau has a right to be for the Cyanamid Co. if they want to. Their representative here has a right to be for that; but common decency, ordinary honesty between man and man, demands that in the exercise of that right the lobbyist representing this organization or any other organization should be honest. My principal charge against Mr. Gray, that has not been answered or defended—it is passed over without notice—is that Chester Gray appeared before the Agriculture Committee some time ago and testified to a falsehood that is material in the consideration of the Muscle Shoals proposition; that he deceived the committee; that he not only deceived the committee but that he afterward took the transcript that the reporter had made of his testimony and, without consent or without talking with the chairman of the committee—whom I observe now honoring me with his presence—without consulting him or anybody else, changed his testimony in a very material way, and that it was printed in the form in which he changed it.

I said on that occasion that later on Mr. Bell, the president of the Farm Bureau, testifying before a House committee, told that committee that the money for this propaganda was supplied by the American Cyanamid Co.; that Chester Gray had charge of the distribution of the literature which I exhibited here at the time, and which I most respectfully call now to the attention of Mr. Thompson, the president of the Farm Bureau, and any other members of that organization, either in my State or elsewhere, who are interested in this controversy, if such it can be called, where Mr. Gray practiced the worst kind of deception, where he told that committee that this thing was paid for by the American Farm Bureau. He knew at the time that not one single cent of the expense was paid by the Farm Bureau.

It was disclosed later by the testimony of Mr. Bell that in this particular activity of which I am now speaking, which did not cover nearly all of them, more than \$7,000 was contributed by the Cyanamid Co.; that Chester Gray was sending out this propaganda, this literature, as a representative of the American Farm Bureau, as though he was representing them in these activities, and said to the committee that this was paid for by the Farm Bureau out of the Farm Bureau funds; that all the time he knew that not one cent was paid by the Farm Bureau; that he was carrying on a propaganda for the American Cyanamid Co. under the guise of a representative of a farm organization; that every cent of the money was paid by this corporation that was getting Muscle Shoals, and when his attention was called to it by the lobby committee he admitted when he was under oath that his former testimony was untrue. I said, when I was debating that charge on the floor of the Senate, that when I found out about this falsehood, this misrepresentation made to a committee of this body, I was about to call the attention of the prosecuting officer in this District to this testimony and was about to ask him to have Chester Gray indicted for perjury, when I discovered that at the time he gave that testimony before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate he was not under oath; and that lets him out. As far as the deception is concerned, however, it is just as great. So that Mr. Thompson has not commented on the worst feature of the activities of Chester Gray.

I have assumed—I do now—that Mr. Thompson is moved by honest motives. He is not here. I presume he gets his information from Mr. Gray. The fact that Mr. Thompson has misstated the record in this respect and in some others in this letter I assume is due to a mistake, and he did not do it intentionally.



If he be honest and wants fairly to represent the farmers of America, he ought to write an apology and spread it broadcast over the skies to the farmers of America for defending this man who now misrepresents and has so long misrepresented this great farm organization in Washington.

Mr. Thompson says, further on:

At no time in its 10 years' existence has the American Farm Bureau Federation, through its legislative department, more energetically represented the cause of agriculture than during the recent tariff debates.

That is in answer to the second charge that he notes here, wherein I charged that Mr. Gray was not representing agriculture in the tariff business; and I reiterate the charge. If Mr. Thompson's representative, Chester Gray, was doing what he or the Farm Bureau wanted them to do in tariff matters, then I think not only Mr. Gray but Mr. Thompson as well misrepresents the farmers of America.

I said then, and I repeat now, that one of his principal activities in connection with the tariff was to appear before a committee of Congress and advocate a tariff on bananas. He wanted bananas taxed so high that the people of the country would have to eat apples instead, and that was the way he was going to help agriculture. I wonder if there is a farmer in the United States who agrees with that proposition and agrees with the practicability of such a proposal.

He did advocate increasing the tariff on some oils and some greases, so that his activities in the Farm Bureau were, in reality, in the main, confined to two things—a tariff on bananas and a tariff on grease. If the farmers of the United States are satisfied with taking any tariff rates which the monopolies and the trusts of the United States are demanding and getting, for which the farmer has to pay, then they were properly represented.

Never once did Mr. Gray raise his voice when there was an attempt made, nor did he ever demand that an attempt be made, to reduce the exorbitant tariff on aluminum, something which goes into every farm household in the United States. Never did he raise his farmer's voice then for relief of agriculture. He was willing that this monopoly, this trust, an organization which, before the courts of the United States, has admitted that it was a monopoly and a trust, should have whatever tariff rates it could get. No objection came from this farm representative.

When there was a proposition to reduce the tariff on rayon, something which enters into the clothing of every farmer's family everywhere in the United States, where was Chester Gray, the farm representative, then? He was as silent as the grave.

When there was an attempt made to reduce the tariff on carbide, one of the products of the Union Carbide Co.—incidentally one of the corporations which, united with the Cyanamid Co., was to get Muscle Shoals under the bill Chester Gray was advocating—when this carbide tariff was up, did we hear Mr. Chester Gray?

Sixty per cent of the carbide used in the United States is used by farmers. Out in the remote parts of the country in the farming communities, where the electric-power lines do not go, the farmers use carbide in making light for their homes. Yet when we tried to reduce the most exorbitant, and I think unholy, rate that is now put upon carbide, the product of one of Chester Gray's clients, I think I can safely say, one of the corporations which, under the guise of a farmers' representative, he has been working for ever since the Cyanamid bid has been pending before the Congress, never once did he raise his voice for farm relief.

Where was Chester Gray when we tried to reduce the exorbitant tariff on steel products? Did he ever raise his voice against the Steel Trust and the benefit it gets from the tariff? Where was he when the fight on the tariff on pig iron was up?

Where was he when we tried to reduce the tariff on the ingredients that go into paint, which every farmer everywhere must use more, in proportion to his number, than any other class of citizens in the United States? The voice of Chester Gray, the Farm Bureau representative, was as silent as the grave.

And so on almost without limit. This man has not represented the farmers. He has been, in reality, trying to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Power Trust, for the Cyanamid Co., for the Union Carbide Co. He has a right to do that, but he ought to sail under his own colors. He has no right to do that under the guise of being a representative of the farmers of the United States.

Mr. Thompson then goes on to tell what a great honor was paid to Chester Gray by the Senate of the United States. He said:

In fact, within the last two weeks, an unusual mark of distinction was conferred on Mr. Gray's department when the United States Senate

ordered a 115-page brief on the subject of tariff prepared in Mr. Gray's office to be printed by the Public Printer as a Senate document.

O Mr. President, let us look at that wonderful document which Mr. Thompson says was prepared in Gray's office. Gray did not have any more to do with the preparation of that document than I did.

I have a copy of it in my hand. It is entitled:

Interchangeability of oils and fats.

Report of American Farm Bureau Federation concerning the interchangeability of oils and fats.

Presented by Mr. SHEPPARD.

Ordered to be printed.

Who prepared it? This shows:

Prepared by W. R. Ogg, M. A., assistant to director, legislative department, in collaboration with G. S. Jamieson, Ph. D., senior chemist in charge oil, fat, and wax laboratory, Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, United States Department of Agriculture, formerly assistant professor of analytical chemistry Yale University.

The only thing Chester Gray had to do with this was that he wrote a letter to Senator SHEPPARD and inclosed this document in it.

This is, in a good many respects, a valuable document. It is a scientific document, prepared, in the main, by officials of the United States Government.

Let us look at random at some of the things it talks about. Let us take up almond oil. It says:

Almond oil is obtained principally from the bitter almond (*Prunus amygdalus*, var. *amara*), although sweet almonds (*Prunus amygdalus*, var. *dulcis*) are occasionally used, and also, rather more frequently, a mixture of the two. (Elsdon, p. 250.)

The commercial oil is expressed (or extracted) chiefly from bitter almonds, the seeds of *Prunus amygdalus*, var. *amara*. \* \* \* The sweet almonds (from *Prunus amygdalus*, var. *dulcis*) are but rarely used alone for the preparation of almond oil. \* \* \* The oils obtained from both varieties are practically identical, so that no definite difference can be established by chemical means.

Let us look at another page, page 9. Speaking of castor beans, it says:

Castor seeds are commonly pressed cold to obtain medicinal oil, and then pressed a second or third time in a hot condition to obtain technical quality oils. (Chalmers, p. 8.)

Used for medicinal purposes. (Gill, pp. 120-121; Martin, p. 130; Lamborn, p. 77; Andes, p. 65; Lewkowitsch, vol. 2, pp. 413-414; Martin, vol. 1, p. 10; Laucks, p. 67; Andes, p. 61.)

Castor oil is an important "nondrying oil" with special properties as a purgative. (Hilditch, p. 102.)

I hope the farmers of the United States, and particularly the farmers of Nebraska, to whom this letter is being sent in profusion, will realize what a valuable thing this is for agriculture. It is filled with such extracts. Here is another one on page 11. I read at random:

#### RUBBER SUBSTITUTES

Competitive with sesame oil or rape oil. Imports of soybean oil and corn oil would also compete with domestic castor oil for this purpose.

And so on through this. Let us go to page 31. Speaking of peanut oil it says:

#### EDIBLE PURPOSES

Used for edible purposes.

I suppose it will be news to the farmers to know that. But that is the scientific statement, and it is interesting to get the authority. I read:

(Lewkowitsch, vol. 1, p. 307; vol. 2, p. 314; Lamborn, p. 76; Martin, vol. 1, p. 10; Hilditch, p. 101.)

The cold-drawn oil is used as salad oil.

I think most farmers' wives know about that already.

(Gill, p. 122; Wright and Mitchell, p. 172.)

So while the trusts and the monopolies in the tariff legislation were robbing the farmer coming and going, Chester Gray was busy writing a letter in which he inclosed this scientific document, prepared mostly by officials of the Government, not a line of which was prepared by Chester Gray. He sent it to the Senator from Texas, who had it printed as a Senate document. Now comes Mr. Thompson, when I say that he had nothing to do with helping the farmer in connection with the tariff, and cites the fact that Chester Gray's office prepared this document, this wonderful scientific document, for the benefit of agriculture.

How much influence did that little thing have with the Senate in voting a tariff on or off anything on earth? Mr. Gray probably consumed several days in writing the letter, which he dic-

tated to a stenographer, I presume, paid for by the farmers of the United States, and now comes the president of the organization and defends him as having done something wonderful for American agriculture. He says further:

Senator NORRIS doesn't understand what he is talking about. Chester H. Gray, legislative representative of this organization, did not indorse the American Cyanamid Co.'s bid for the operation of Muscle Shoals. He took the indorsement which was given to this bid at the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation held in Chicago on December 8, 1926, and acting under those instructions proceeded to support the measure.

That is the cruelest cut of all, when the farmers of the United States understand what the truth is. Chester Gray, through his activity in behalf of the Power Trust, the Cyanamid Co., and the Union Carbide Co., induced the officials, through methods I will explain as I proceed, to go out into the country and get the Farm Bureau to indorse the Cyanamid bid. Now, after the rank and file of the farmers, without understanding it, without knowing anything about it, have been deceived by their leaders, whose expenses were paid by the American Cyanamid Co. or the Union Carbide Co. or the Tennessee Development Co., one or the other, who, after traveling ostensibly as the representatives of the American Farm Bureau, induced their officials to indorse this bid. After deceiving them that way, now comes Thompson and says, "We could not help it. The Farm Bureau decided that themselves, and Gray just carried out their instructions."

I will develop some evidence as I proceed which will throw the light of publicity on such a proposition. Let me say in passing only a word or two about something in the letter which refers to me personally.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BLAINE. My attention was attracted to the statement the Senator made in his remarks just a moment ago with reference to the Farm Bureau having directed Mr. Gray to do these things.

I think the Senator will find upon close examination of the testimony before the lobby committee that Mr. Gray boasted of the fact that he drafted most of the resolution and took it to their executive committee or their convention, and they adopted it, instructing him to do those things.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly, under his advice.

Mr. BLAINE. In other words, he was the author of the resolutions and boasted of it.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I thank the Senator for calling more specific attention to it than I have in an indirect way.

After Mr. Thompson praises Chester Gray for his great activities in connection with the tariff in favor of agriculture, he takes a personal slap at me and compares my record with that of several other Senators, including my colleague [Mr. HOWELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], and some others. I do not care to get into a controversy for the purpose of this discussion or any other. For the sake of the argument at least I will plead guilty and confess that these other Senators are far in advance of me. I only have my humble viewpoint as one who has done the best he could ever since the war to study the farm situation and to do what he conscientiously believed would help the farmer.

Some of the Senators with whom he has compared me and with whose record he has compared mine have not had the same opportunities that I have had. They have not been on the committee. If they were on the committee they did not have what came to me more perhaps than any other Member of this body after the war. The testimony of men and women from all over the country, especially the great Middle West, from the great agricultural part of the country, came to me showing without dispute the terrible stress in which agriculture was placed. In my humble efforts to bring relief to them, to do my mite toward relieving them, I have come in contact with this man who claims to represent the farmers of America, who has never yet once turned his hand to help in any of the efforts through which in my humble way I have been striving to bring relief to the farmers.

In his letter Mr. Thompson makes certain statements. I do not accuse him of telling a falsehood. He probably got his information from Mr. Gray. It may be that Mr. Gray has written this letter like he wrote a good many other things for other people. But it was stated in the letter that I am not a friend of the farmer, and he gives some reasons, one of which is that I voted against a tariff on hides.

Whatever may be my sins and whatever there may be wrong or good in that vote, I have to say that I voted for a tariff on hides notwithstanding his statement, and the roll call record of the Senate will show it. I am not boasting of it. It is a two-sided question as to whether it will really benefit the farmer or not, but I gave the farmer the benefit of the doubt.

Later on, when the tariff on hides was coupled with a protective tariff upon leather, upon boots, and upon shoes, I voted against the combination. Of all the things I have ever done I feel as well satisfied with that vote as any I have ever cast—without in the meantime finding fault with any Senator looking at it from a different viewpoint who voted the other way. But the majority of the Senate voted as I did. I do not know that Chester Gray has been active in that matter. I do not know that Chester Gray even was trying to get the tariff on hides coupled with an exorbitant tariff on boots and shoes and leather. When it came to saddling upon the farmer an increased price for every pair of shoes that he or any member of his family bought, increasing the price of every piece of harness that he purchased, in order to get a tariff on hides, I refused to vote that way. I still believe that I was right. Knowing, too, what everybody admits, that the tariff on hides would only in part go to the farmer, that perhaps the greatest bulk of it would go to the great packers, I voted as I have just stated.

But, Mr. President, I have no desire to defend my own record. Even if I am misrepresenting the farmers of America, that is no defense to Chester Gray in the false representations which he has made to the men who paid his salary and who paid it by saving the pennies which come from their toil and their sacrifice to remunerate this man who has been able to utilize his time to help the trusts, the combinations, and the Cyanamid Co. bid, of which I shall have more to say as I proceed.

Mr. President, Chester Gray was summoned as a witness before the lobby committee. Incidentally I digress to say that not only does Mr. Thompson attack me, but he attacks the lobby committee. He does not blame the lobby committee, but puts all the blame on me because I appointed the lobby committee. He does not once say that any of the evidence they developed was false. He does not contradict a single thing that the lobby committee has produced; but it was a bad committee because it caught Chester Gray, with others, red-handed in his false propaganda to deceive the farmers of America in regard to Muscle Shoals.

I am only going to read excerpts from his testimony before the lobby committee because it is quite voluminous and every word of it interesting. In almost every paragraph it shows that instead of representing the farmer he was representing somebody else while he pretended to represent the farmer and went under the name of the farmers' representative.

Senator WALSH of Montana asked him:

You did tell us a while ago that he was nominally—

He spoke of a Mr. Bower, a representative traveling over the country under the name of the Farm Bureau, but paid by the Cyanamid Co. or the Union Carbide Co. or the Tennessee River Improvement Co. There is some doubt as to which one paid him at different times, but he was paid all the time by one or the other or two or more of those organizations; but he always represented wherever he went that he was a Farm Bureau representative. He had letters of introduction showing that he was a representative of the Farm Bureau—letters signed by Chester Gray. He was sent out over the country to deceive the very men who had employed him to represent the farmers in Washington. Senator WALSH in his question is referring to Mr. Bower—

You did tell us a while ago that while he was nominally to be on the pay roll of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, he was to be paid by the Tennessee River Improvement Association.

Mr. GRAY. Yes. I have said that several times this morning, and that is my understanding of the situation.

Senator WALSH of Montana. But that was not your understanding of the situation at the time you wrote this letter, because at that time your understanding was that the Colonel Worthington organization, the Tennessee River Improvement Association, was not to furnish the money but it was to be furnished either by the Union Carbide Co. or by the American Cyanamid Co.

Mr. GRAY. No; I said I got a different slant on it when I talked with those gentlemen, but my later knowledge—

Senator WALSH of Montana. That, of course, means that whatever Colonel Worthington may be protesting to you about, your conviction about the matter was that the money would not come from the Tennessee River Improvement Association but would come from the Carbide Co.—

And so on, showing that this man who went out with letters of introduction from Chester Gray to the farmers of America



was known by Chester Gray as being paid by one of these organizations having a direct influence in the Muscle Shoals legislation. He was sent out to deceive the farmers, realizing that on the face of the situation he was a representative of the farmers, a representative of Chester Gray. Being their employed representative, they would naturally have confidence in him. Although he was clothed in the clothing of the Farm Bureau, he was in reality a wolf in sheep's clothing, deceiving the men whom he was supposed to represent. It is immaterial whether he was paid by the Union Carbide Co., the American Cyanamid Co., or the Tennessee River Improvement Association. It was all the same. He and Chester Gray did not let the farmers know who paid them.

One of the men who figured a great deal in this matter was a man by the name of O'Neal, a gentleman who was the president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation. He wrote a letter to a Mr. Lee whose name appeared several times in the testimony. I want to quote briefly from it. This is a letter written by Mr. O'Neal to Mr. Lee, and I read just a brief extract from it:

So I feel that he can certainly be of great service on the Muscle Shoals, which he knows a great deal about.

He is speaking of Bower.

And we, of the Farm Bureau, can back him up with letters of introduction, etc., to our Farm Bureau people for the service that he has rendered. But I frankly advised him to work for the Tennessee River Improvement Association, which we have always cooperated with 100 per cent.

That is what the farm bureau by its representatives was doing.

But I frankly advised him to work with the Tennessee River Improvement Association, which we have always cooperated with 100 per cent, or with the American Cyanamid Co. Either of these would be a better arrangement for him and he could still continue to work on the Shoals, and we could use him effectively.

That is the way the farmers of America were being deceived. Gray wrote a letter to O'Neal, and I want to read something from that letter. There was a great deal of correspondence between O'Neal and Chester Gray, this American Farm Bureau Federation representative. They worked in very close cooperation trying to save Muscle Shoals for the Power Trust. They did it by trying to get behind the propaganda to the farmers of America under a false pretense that they were going to make cheap fertilizer. Gray, a shrewd man, knows, if he knows anything, that that bid was a deception and a snare. That has been demonstrated over and over again.

In his letter of June 1, 1929, to Mr. O'Neal, Chester Gray states:

I am seeing Senator WALCOTT, of Connecticut, who is a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who threatened, or at least indicated his intention to file a minority report against the Norris resolution and the Government operation of the Shoals. I hope to be able to supply the Senator some material which will be useful to him in getting up his minority report.

Mr. President, if Mr. Gray was not practicing deception upon the farmer I would not find any fault with that; he would have a perfect right to do that. The point here is that he was pretending to the farmers of America that he was their representative, and yet the money to carry on the propaganda came from the corporations that were directly interested in the bid for which he was working. He says further in this letter—this is Chester Gray now speaking:

Mr. White—

Now listen to this, Senators:

Mr. White was here for half of the week and made many contacts in his own behalf.

Mr. White was another man working with them to get Muscle Shoals for the Cyanamid Co. or the Union Carbide Co.

I was ready to get him conferences at the White House—

This man was influential even with the President, as I shall show—

so that President Hoover would have a personal acquaintance with him, but explained to him that if he and his congressional friends thought it better to make the approach at the White House through political channels I would very gladly retire so that the most possible good could come to him in his White House conference. His friends are working through political circles now to get a conference with him at the White House, which I think will be in the near future and for which Mr. White will return to Washington. I believe he did some very effective work in a

quiet way while he was here. He understands fully that a man must not become too much of a propagandist in his own behalf but must let his friends do the work for him.

Very truly yours,  
(Signed)

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
CHESTER H. GRAY,  
Washington Representative.

Chester Gray wrote another letter to O'Neal, from which I want to quote very briefly. He said in closing—

I am giving you this information—

Perhaps I ought to read the information that Chester Gray is giving, as it shows his viewpoint and how he not only deceived the farmer, and not only deceived or attempted to deceive the President of the United States, but deceived O'Neal himself, his confederate in this matter, telling him a falsehood. Just after the President pocket-vetoed the Muscle Shoals joint resolution when Congress passed it at the last session, Gray wrote to O'Neal—and this is only a part of the letter—

The reason for making such a statement to the President was explained to him as being the plans which I already knew of to undermine you and create dissatisfaction among the farmers of Alabama with your leadership. All this explanation, which took much more time, of course, in my conversation with the President than I am troubling you with here in this letter, secured from him the remark that it would be unfortunate for anything like that which I described to happen to you, since you were a sound and straight thinker and were doing such a constructive piece of work for southern agriculture. This made me think that if for no other reason than this fact than its effect upon you, the President would be very hesitant to allow the Muscle Shoals bill to become a law.

I am giving you this information in our usual confidential manner, but know that it will cheer you to know that at least one of the factors which has induced Coolidge to continue with us on the Muscle Shoals legislation was his regard for you and his desire that nothing he might do should harm you.

Very sincerely,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU,  
CHESTER H. GRAY,  
Washington Representative.

He said to Mr. O'Neal that when he went down to see President Coolidge to get him to pocket veto the Muscle Shoals measure he told him what a "slam" it would be to Mr. O'Neal, how it would knock him out if he signed the bill, what a wonderful man Mr. O'Neal was, how hard he had worked for southern agriculture, and by that kind of argument he induced the President to pocket veto the bill. He let Mr. O'Neal understand that that was the reason why the President pocket vetoed the bill; in other words, he tried to make Mr. O'Neal believe that out of respect for O'Neal and to save him trouble the President refused to sign the joint resolution.

O'Neal is his own friend, his confederate; all the way through they were working together, as the evidence discloses; yet he tells that story to O'Neal. Let us see what he really believes the facts to be. He did not believe what he wrote O'Neal; he probably made no such argument to the President, but he made O'Neal believe not only that he made such an argument but that that was the argument that brought about the pocket veto of that bill. He was questioned by the committee, and, referring to that letter, the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], who is now listening to what I say, asked him some questions about the letter from which I just read.

Senator BLACK. Do you remember writing Mr. O'Neal that one of the most forceful factors in bringing about the veto of that bill by the President was the argument presented by you to the President in reference to Mr. O'Neal?

Mr. GRAY. Yes; I wrote him along that line.

Senator BLACK. You wrote Mr. O'Neal along that line?

Mr. GRAY. According to my recollection, I did.

Senator BLACK. Is it your judgment that one of the most forceful and effective arguments used with Mr. Coolidge in the vetoing of that bill was the argument that it would injure Mr. O'Neal in Alabama? Do you think it had anything to do with the vetoing?

Mr. GRAY. I doubt if it did.

That gives a little insight into this man Gray's character. He said to his friend and confederate, "The President vetoed the measure because of the argument I made to him based on a statement as to how it would hurt you if he signed it." Under oath before the committee, however, he admits that he did not believe that argument had anything to do with the veto. In this instance, under oath, he told the truth, but when he wrote that letter to his friend, Mr. O'Neal, he deceived his own friend, his own confederate. So he not only practiced deception upon

the farmers of America but upon the men who worked with him as his confidential agents and friends. He deceives whenever it seems to his interest to do so. Mr. Gray not only worked the Cyanamid Co., the Union Carbide Co., and the Tennessee River Improvement Association, which was trying to advance the interests of the Cyanamid Co.'s bid, but he had conferences with those representing the Power Trust as well. When he was before the lobby committee he was questioned about that. The committee had some letters and documents in their possession, and Gray knew it. So he did not dare deny that he had had conferences with the power interests. When Mr. Gray was on the stand the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] asked him this question:

Do you remember when you had the conference about the power?  
Mr. GRAY. What conference?

Mark the innocence of the man—"What conference?"

Senator BLACK. The extra-confidential conference you had about the power, the agreement with the power companies, December 29, 1928.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is now getting down to a definite time. He had a number of documents in his possession, and Gray did not dare dispute what he knew to be the truth if the Senator from Alabama could worm it out of him; but listen to the way he tried to avoid being frank and honest with the committee—"What conference?"

Senator BLACK. The extraconfidential conference you had about the power, the agreement with the power companies December 29, 1928. Do you remember those conferences?

Mr. GRAY. With whom were they held, Senator?

He is still avoiding an answer.

Senator BLACK. Whom did you hold conferences with about dividing up the power down there? What power-company officials did you meet with from time to time?

Mr. GRAY. I had a conference with the power people.

Senator BLACK. Who were they?

Mr. GRAY.—

There is a plain question—"Who were they?"—see what his answer is—

Mr. GRAY. The first week that I was a director here, in January, 1926.

He has not answered the question.

Senator BLACK asked:

All right; who were they?

Mr. GRAY. I had a conference in New York City with a group of power people.

Senator BLACK. Who were they?

Mr. GRAY. Just a moment. But I don't know that I have had a conference with the power people since that time.

Senator BLACK. Well, who were they?

Mr. GRAY.—

All the time the Senator from Alabama was asking Mr. Gray a fair, point-blank question, but up to this point he has given evasive answers every time. That is Chester Gray; that is the way he treated the Agricultural Committee; that is the way he treats every committee when he is trying to cover up and conceal the truth. But the Senator from Alabama kept after him; over and over again he asked him the same question, and Gray finally answered it, a little at a time, as will be seen.

Senator BLACK. Well, who were they?

Mr. GRAY. I thought Owen D. Young was going to be there, but he didn't show up.

Still Gray has not answered the question.

Senator BLACK. He didn't show up?

Mr. GRAY. No.

Now, listen to the examination, Senators.

Senator BLACK. Who did?

Mr. GRAY. Martin.

As will be shown later, Martin was not the only man who showed up. Gray was trying to avoid giving direct answers to the questions; he was trying to conceal from the committee the Power Trust officials with whom he was in secret conference. This farmers' friend, this man paid by the farmers of America was trying to hold back that information from the world and from the Senate committee. So he says Martin was there.

Senator BLACK. Tom Martin, of the Alabama Power Co.?

Mr. GRAY. Cobb, of the East Tennessee Power Co., or whatever its name is. I don't know. An attorney for the Alabama Power Co.—

Senator BLACK. Who was he?

Mr. GRAY. I can get the names out of the files here.

Senator BLACK. You can't remember the names now?

Mr. GRAY. I have got them here.

Senator BLACK. Can you remember his name without that?

Mr. GRAY. No.

Senator BLACK. Who else was in on that conference?

Mr. GRAY. Two or three other gentlemen.

He has not answered yet.

Senator BLACK. Who else?

Mr. GRAY. Myself; Mr. Reed, who had just retired as director of the Washington work for the American Farm Bureau Federation; and Mr. Harvey, whose connection I did not then and do not now know.

Still holding back the names that he knew Senator BLACK was trying to bring out; still concealing from the committee the real truth; still trying his usual deception and practicing it upon this committee.

But Senator BLACK pursues him:

Senator BLACK. Who else was in on that conference?

Mr. GRAY. Two or three other gentlemen.

Senator BLACK. Who else?

Mr. GRAY. Myself; Mr. Reed, who had just retired as director of the Washington work for the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. Harvey, whose connection I did not then and do not now know.

So Senator BLACK puts a leading question to him:

Was Mr. Bell there?

Bell is the president of the American Cyanamid Co.

Senator BLACK. Was Mr. Bell there?

Mr. GRAY. No. That was before I hardly knew Mr. Bell, or had hardly heard of the American Cyanamid Co. In fact, that was at a time when we considered the proposition of getting a proposal like the Ford tender, which had been withdrawn, almost hopeless. But when you mention 1928—

Senator BLACK. I haven't asked you about that. Was Mr. Aylesworth there?

Now you are getting down to it. Now you are getting into the Power Trust. Aylesworth! a familiar sound. Do we remember, when the Federal Trade Commission started the investigation against the Power Trust, that Aylesworth was the head of the organization here in Washington, or connected with it, to which was given by the Power Trust \$400,000 to control the Senate of the United States? And so Senator BLACK says:

Was Mr. Aylesworth there?

Now, Gray knew all the time that Aylesworth was there. Gray is a shrewd man. He knew Aylesworth, and he knew his connection with the Power Trust; and so Senator BLACK says:

Was Mr. Aylesworth there?

Mr. GRAY. Aylesworth was spokesman.

He was the head of the whole business, you see.

Senator BLACK. You didn't remember his name at first.

Mr. GRAY. He was connected then with the National Electric Light Co.

He did not answer Senator BLACK's question, you see.

Senator BLACK. And the Electric Bond & Share Co., wasn't he?

Mr. GRAY. I don't know about that.

He does know about it. Everybody knows about it, and that Aylesworth is one of the leading representatives of the Power Trust of the United States. There will be some more about this power proposition later on.

Referring to this same conference or, rather, to these same people—I do not know whether it occurred at this particular conference or not—they tried to bring about an agreement to have an understanding that they would not put in writing, so that when they were asked the question by committees of Congress they could say, "There is no agreement between the power people and the Cyanamid Co.," and yet they were going to have a secret understanding. They had to leave it in that shape so as not to let Congress know the truth, and Gray was in on that plan of deception.

Listen to this.

Senator BLACK is examining. Senator BLACK says:

Now, Mr. Gray, you say no agreement was reached, and Mr. Bell—

Remember, Mr. Bell is president of the Cyanamid Co.—

and Mr. Bell has said no agreement was reached. I want to call your attention to certain instructions that you received from Mr. Bell. I don't care to show them to you now. I just want to refresh your recollection on them. They are with reference to the proposal to be made to the power companies. There was a first proposal given you for consideration to present to them, and a second alternative, but with reference to each of the two Mr. Bell told you that under no circumstances



would it do to make an express agreement, because if an express agreement was made, or understanding, that it would not stand up under the law with reference to monopolies, and that therefore the understanding between the Cyanamid Co. and the power companies must be tacit, as understood between gentlemen. Do you remember that?

Mr. GRAY. Yes.

Senator BLACK. You do?

Mr. GRAY. And he explained that to the Military Affairs Committee, that nothing came of it.

Senator BLACK. I am not asking what he explained to the Military Affairs Committee. Do you remember that?

Mr. GRAY. Yes.

Senator BLACK. Just state what he told you in any conference about it must not be reduced to writing and it must not be placed in such a way that anybody could say there was an agreement. Just explain that.

Mr. GRAY. What is your question again, please?

Senator BLACK. You recall, don't you, that he said in his instructions to you that whatever understanding was reached, it must be reached in such a way that no one could say there was an absolute agreement or contract made? You remember that, don't you?

Mr. GRAY. Yes; I do.

Senator BLACK. And that under no circumstances would it do for the power company and the Cyanamid Co. to agree in any other way except that?

Mr. GRAY. That is the way I remember it.

Senator BLACK. And he came before the committee and said they had made no agreement, didn't he?

Mr. GRAY. Yes.

So that Mr. Gray was not only engaged in fooling the farmers and in fooling the men who were working with him, but he was trying to deceive the country and the Congress, in addition to other things that he had done, by entering into a conspiracy that the Power Trust and the Cyanamid Co. should have an understanding that the Cyanamid Co. should get the bill through, and that they would have an understanding as to what they should do with the power afterwards; but that no agreement should be put in writing because it might be developed, and it would not of course be pleasant and probably would defeat the whole thing if the real secret agreement was known. Chester Gray, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was in on that agreement.

Here is something from a letter written by Mr. Gray to Mr. O'Neal—a very interesting letter, all of it, but it is quite lengthy and I will not read all of it. He tells in it what kind of a job they were putting up to fool certain Members of Congress, and goes on to tell about other things. This is what Gray said:

I am trying this week to get in touch with Secretary Hoover—

That was when President Hoover was Secretary of Commerce. That was before President Coolidge had pocket vetoed the other bill.

I am trying this week to get in touch with Secretary Hoover on your nitrate-shipping proposition and the Muscle Shoals matter generally, as I know you will agree that he is one of the men with whom we might have to work on the Muscle Shoals project in the future.

Anticipating what later happened, he goes on:

There is a likelihood, too, that I will see Governor Smith—

There might be a possibility that they would have to deal with him later; so he was going to "catch them coming and going." He was ready to deal with anybody who would pull his chestnuts out of the fire. He says in this letter to Mr. O'Neal, dated July 9:

There is a likelihood, too, that I will see Governor Smith quite soon in order to let him know what we stand for at the Shoals, so that he inadvertently will not say something in his address which might embarrass us and compromise himself.

Was not that considerate of him?

With these three contacts going—that is, Hill with James and myself with Hoover and Smith—we will be doing something at least toward getting our project under way next fall.

Here is some testimony that came after the letter from which I have read. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is examining Mr. Gray:

Senator WALSH of Montana. It appears that Mr. Hill, who was apparently favorable to your general proposition, was endeavoring to get Mr. Bell to concede something in respect to the recapture clause.

I wish Senators would notice this. Here was an attempt on the part of Congressman Hill, when the Bell proposition was pending, to get Bell to make it a little better for the Government; to make it a little more certain that it could be honestly accepted by the Government; and it is brought out that Mr.

Gray, while he pretended to represent the farmers of America, would not concede that they should go to Bell and try to get him to make a better offer than he had made. Mr. Gray was working for the Cyanamid Co. and not for the farmers of America, as this examination will show; and you will see again how he tried to avoid the real question that Senator WALSH of Montana was asking him.

Reading the question again:

It appears that Mr. Hill—

Who was a Congressman—

who was apparently favorable to your general proposition, was endeavoring to get Mr. Bell to concede something in respect to the recapture clause.

Mr. GRAY. Yes; he was.

Senator WALSH of Montana. He was endeavoring to enlist your services in prevailing upon Mr. Bell to make that concession in the interest of getting the legislation through?

In other words, Congressman Hill was trying to get Gray, knowing that he was the real representative of Bell, of the Cyanamid Co., to get Bell to make an offer that was a little better for the farmers of America than the one he had made; and Senator WALSH of Montana asks Mr. Gray this question: He—

That means Hill—

was endeavoring to enlist your services in prevailing upon Mr. Bell to make that concession in the interest of getting the legislation through?

Mr. GRAY. That is true.

Senator WALSH of Montana. And you answered objecting to the request of Congressman Hill; insisting you ought to try to get it through just as it was?

He did not want the concession made for the benefit of the farmers. What is Mr. Gray's answer to that?—

Mr. GRAY. Yes; that is true.

Senator WALSH of Montana. How is it that you, representing the farmers of the country, were unwilling to make any concession or attempt to get any concession with respect to the recapture clause?

Mr. GRAY. Only this: Mr. Bell, who is the president of the American Cyanamid Co., and whose money is going into it, had told me that he had given everything in the way of recapture which he could give and stand by his offer, and if the Military Affairs Committee had written in other things in the recapture clause than were in it at that time, he could not stand for other and additional recapture. May I say further—

Senator WALSH of Montana. No—

Mr. GRAY. The recapture clause don't please me as it is now.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Let me remark that Mr. Hill's proposition was not at all that the Military Affairs Committee should lay down any proposition. Mr. Hill's proposition was that you should join in endeavoring to persuade Mr. Bell to make concessions.

Senator BLACK. That was Mr. O'Neal's proposition, instead of Mr. Hill's.

Mr. GRAY. I had talked with Mr. Bell about making that—

Senator WALSH of Montana. No, no; but you answered you wouldn't do it. You wouldn't accede to the request of Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Hill.

Mr. GRAY. In my correspondence—

Still avoiding:

Senator WALSH of Montana. You refused to do it on the ground that you could get the bill through as it was.

Mr. GRAY. Yes, sir; and the reason I stated that in my letter—

Senator WALSH of Montana. Now—

Mr. GRAY. Pardon me.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Of course, the severity of the recapture clause provision was a matter of consequence to the Cyanamid Co.?

Mr. GRAY. Yes.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Of course, they wanted as easy a recapture clause as they could get.

Mr. GRAY. I presume that is true.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Rather, I mean that they wanted to make the recapture by the Government as difficult as possible.

Senator CARAWAY. And as expensive.

Mr. GRAY. And as expensive to the Government.

Senator WALSH of Montana. And as expensive.

Mr. GRAY. I would naturally suppose that to be so.

Senator WALSH of Montana. Exactly. Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Hill were endeavoring to get you to go to Bell and get him to make some concession over and above what he had theretofore offered?

Mr. GRAY. Yes.

Senator BLACK. I can understand why the Cyanamid Co. would want to have the recapture by the Government as burdensome and onerous as possible; but why should you, having in mind the interest of the farmers of the country?

Mr. GRAY. I was not averse to doing it.

Senator WALSH of Montana. But you declined to do it.

Mr. GRAY. Because I had seen Mr. Bell, and these gentlemen had not, and I knew he wouldn't stand for it.

Senator WALSH of Montana. But that was not your reason. You didn't say to Mr. O'Neal, "I have done everything with Mr. Bell that I can do, and Mr. Bell is obdurate about the matter. He tells me he has made all the concessions he possibly can." You didn't answer the letter that way at all.

Mr. GRAY. No; that is not in the letter.

Senator WALSH of Montana. That letter says that you believe it is unnecessary, that you can get the thing through as it stands.

Mr. GRAY. Which was a wise legislative strategy, because if we had opened up again Mr. Bell's known opposition to accept the entire bill, it would have delayed the report on it.

Senator WALSH of Montana. They didn't ask you to open it up in opposition to Mr. Bell. They asked you to go to Mr. Bell and endeavor to get him to join with you.

Mr. GRAY. Which I did.

Senator WALSH of Montana. But you said you wouldn't.

Mr. GRAY. After they wrote me I couldn't, because I knew his position on it, Senator.

Senator WALSH of Montana. But you didn't say that. You said you wouldn't do it because you thought you could get the bill through as it was.

Mr. GRAY. Because I had already found the situation relative to Mr. Bell, and the bill was moving gradually through the committee, and if we started to write it over it would mean no bill.

Senator WALSH of Montana. But you didn't tell them that. That was not the ground upon which you put your refusal. You put your refusal on the ground that you could get the bill through as it was.

Mr. GRAY. Yes; as it was.

So here was Chester Gray, this farmer representative, when he was requested by a Member of the House of Representatives to go to Mr. Bell and try to get him to give something more to the Government, some better offer to the farmers if he could get Muscle Shoals, this man representing the farmers refused to intercede with Bell to have him make a better offer, and the reason he gave was, "It is not necessary. I have power enough, with my confederates, to get it through as it is."

Whom was he representing then, the farmers of the United States, or the Cyanamid Co. and the Union Carbide Co.?

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. While the Senator is discussing that, I hope he will go back and read his explanation of the telling of an untruth to the committee in answer to the Senator's question, when he was before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. NORRIS. I have commented on that.

Mr. CARAWAY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not read his testimony before the lobby committee, where he admitted it, but I made the statement that he had admitted it before the lobby committee. Perhaps if this goes on to another chapter I will take occasion to read the testimony itself.

Here is a letter to Mr. Gray, written by Mr. O'Neal, the man who is his confederate, his ally, his coworker, and the man whom Gray deceived and falsely told of what plea he had made in his behalf before President Coolidge, and that that was the reason why Coolidge vetoed the Muscle Shoals bill. This letter was written July 12, 1928. O'Neal starts out by saying:

My dear Chester.

That is Mr. Gray, "My dear Chester." There are a good many things in that letter, and I am not going to read it all, although it is all interesting. In one place he says:

My dear boy, we must get our heads together, review all the facts we have learned by experience in our fight for Muscle Shoals, capitalize by recognizing our failures and evolve a plan that will put it over.

I am delighted to see that you are going to seek Governor Smith and Mr. Hoover. I wish I could be with you on both occasions.

Would it not have been grand if they could have been together?

In my own mind I don't feel that we can get over a Government-operation plan—

And so forth.

Further on in the letter he says to "dear Chester":

I wish you had the time to review all these facts, the fight for the last 10 years, in your mind, and set them down on paper in the form of a brief, our successes and failures. This would help to guide us. Now is our opportunity to put the thing over and I firmly believe that we can do it. Mr. Hoover himself suggested the plan that I discussed with you. While my mind is not made up on this plan yet, it has some very strong points, I fully believe.

So these two men saw the candidates for President on the Republican and Democratic tickets, or at least said they were going to do it, and fix them right on Muscle Shoals, so that when they wrote letters of acceptance or made speeches they would not make mistakes on that important matter. Yet they frankly said to these candidates for President:

Get our idea. We are going to bring the farmers' votes. Help us pull the chestnuts out of the fire in the name of the American farmer but for the benefit of the Cyanamid Co. and the Union Carbide Co., who are paying the expenses.

I see the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] honoring me with his attention, and it might be interesting for him to find out what was said in one letter written by O'Neal to "dear Chester." He used this language after telling how to get various kinds of fellows:

I believe we can get HEFLIN if we work right.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, does the Senator have any idea what sort of a spell they expected to throw on me?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know, except that possibly they expected to say that if the Cyanamid Co. did not get it the Pope would, or something of that kind.

Well, I shall read a little more from a letter from "Dear Chester" to "Dear Mr. O'Neal." This was written July 24, 1929, and in it I find this:

I know the question which will be uppermost in your mind will be whether or not you as president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation desire to send out a member of the personnel when the finances to support him come from sources other than the regular income of your federation.

Do Senators see what that is? Do they get that? He says:

I am aware that you may have some hesitancy in sending out somebody in the name of the federation paid for by this interested party.

He says:

I know the question which will be uppermost in your mind.

I read on:

There is nothing new in this proposition to us, as it has been done before, so that I presume your hesitancy in this regard will not be very pronounced.

He says, in substance, to O'Neal:

It may go against your conscience to do this deceitful thing and to fool your farmers, but you ought not to be so pronounced in those convictions. We have done it before, and it works all right.

God bless you, he has been engaged in the business of deceiving farmers for the past 10 years. It is nothing new to him, as he says:

There is nothing new in this proposition to us—

Said "Dear Chester" to "Dear O'Neal"—

It has been done before, so that I presume your hesitancy in this regard will not be very pronounced.

I presume also it will be best for Mr. Bower—

the man the Farm Bureau sent out under the name of the Farm Bureau with letters of recommendation from Gray and others to the farmers of the United States, to the executive officials of the different farm bureaus in the different States, to get them to indorse the Cyanamid bid. And now they are hurling back at them, as Mr. Thompson says in the letter from which I have quoted to-day, "We had to do it because you asked us to do it."

And God knows the reason they asked was because Chester Gray put up this job here. They put up this gigantic job to fool the farmers of the United States, to bring them, body and soul, to influence your vote and my vote to give away this valuable asset to the Water Power Trust and to the great combinations of the United States. He said:

I presume also it will be best for Mr. Bower, if he goes out under authorization of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, to make his contacts with a report to the Washington office as a matter of convenience in getting work done if for no other reason.

You had better send him out under the name of the Farm Bureau even though the Cyanamid Co. is paying his salary and paying his expenses. That is the best way to fool them. We have done it to dear Chester first, and we feel all right about it. It will not hurt you if you do it.

In the same letter he said further:

I wish to add, however, to the list of States which are mentioned in the letter above referred to the State of Oklahoma.



See how they are trying to rope in this fine man, Mr. Simpson, of Oklahoma. Many Senators, especially those on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the last 10 years, will remember him. He frequently appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He is a very able man and the head of the Farmers' Union. Chester Gray wants to get them as well as the officials of the Farm Bureau. I think probably Simpson belongs to both organizations.

I wish to add, however, to the list of States which are mentioned in the letter above referred to the State of Oklahoma. We have a very strong farm leader there—John Simpson, president of the Oklahoma Farmers' Union—who is influential not only with Senator THOMAS, whose vote we need here at Washington, but also is a power in the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America. It might be that with John Simpson thoroughly informed upon the subject of Muscle Shoals, the Farmers' Union in its annual meeting next October would take a position similar to that held by the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation.

That is the American Farm Bureau Federation. That explains itself. There is a secret proposition to get Mr. Simpson and through him to get the Farmers' Union into this nefarious, deceptive scheme. He put out that feeler in this letter.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not notice the date of the letter which Mr. O'Neal wrote to "Dear Chester" regarding me.

Mr. NORRIS. I will find it in a moment for the Senator.

Mr. HEFLIN. It is not very important, I talked with both Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Gray in the reception room of the Senate, and I think my colleague told them the same that I did when I said that I would not favor the Cyanamid bid or any other bid that did not have a provision in the recapture clause that would guarantee the making annually of 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, and that unless such a provision was agreed upon, there was no use discussing the matter with me.

Mr. NORRIS. I have the date now. It was July 31, 1929. The Senator will remember, in speaking of what he demanded, that that is what Congressman Hill demanded, and it was said to Gray, "You know Bell. You are his representative and all that. Go to Bell and see if he will not put that in and make it definite." The Senator knows that is one of the jokers in the Cyanamid Co.'s bid, that as a matter of fact, while on the face of it it is trying to make Congress believe that it means to manufacture 40,000 tons annually, yet it does not mean anything of the kind, and they never will manufacture it under that bid. They tried to get Gray to go to Bell and say, "Put that in, make it stronger," and Gray said, "No; I can get it through as it is. I have enough control over Presidents and Senators and Members of the House, and it is so much better this way for the Cyanamid Co. I will not ask that any change be made."

Mr. HEFLIN. I remember distinctly on one occasion when I talked to O'Neal and told him my position that he agreed with me. I said the proposition in the first place was to have fertilizer made there for the farmer and that I was not going to support any bid which does not carry out that part of the contract. He agreed that I was right about it. So it seems that they are mixed up on both sides of the proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Gray had some suggestions to make to President Coolidge.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion in connection with the last letter?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. BLACK. In connection with the proposition that was made by Mr. Gray to Mr. O'Neal asking that he carry Mr. Bower on the Alabama Power Co. pay roll, the Senator may have the letter to refer to later, but Mr. O'Neal declined to do that.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Later evidence developed that Mr. Bower was carried in some way on the Tennessee River Improvement Association pay roll and paid \$725 a month by the Union Carbide Co.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator for the interruption.

"Dear Chester" wrote a letter to "My dear Mr. Sanders," who happened to be a private secretary to President Coolidge, in which he said:

MY DEAR MR. SANDERS: If you consider the attached memorandum of enough importance to justify your doing so, I believe it would be helpful to lay it on the desk of President Coolidge.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
CHESTER H. GRAY,  
Washington Representative.

This is the memorandum he inclosed and wanted submitted to the President:

Memorandum.

The Senate situation on Muscle Shoals relative to the Willis bill, which measure is identic, word for word, with the Madden measure—

Both of those bills were acceptances, the one in the Senate by Senator Willis and the one in the House by Congressman Madden, of the Cyanamid bid for Muscle Shoals.

The Senate situation on Muscle Shoals relative to the Willis bill, which measure is identical word for word, with the Madden measure, is such that action in the House should be taken before a vote is had in the Senate on the Norris Government operation resolution.

It is suggested as a method to help action on the House side that if Congressman WAINWRIGHT, of New York, and Congressman WURZBACH, of Texas, could be informed as to the desire that the Madden bill be reported as it now reads a vote in the House committee would be very much expedited.

It would stimulate Senator Willis also in his leadership of the Senate fight if he could be informed that his measure is the one bill available to defeat Government operation at the shoals.

Senators will remember that that was the time when we passed a bill similar to the last one which was pocket vetoed by President Coolidge. When that bill was in the Senate there was an analysis of the Cyanamid bid made on the floor of the Senate which so completely convinced every Senator that it was a nefarious and obnoxious bid that no one here ever even offered it.

Senator Willis, of Ohio, became convinced that it could not pass, that everybody was against it because they knew of the jokers that were in it; they knew what the analysis disclosed with reference to the things that made it objectionable; that made it absolutely offensive; and it never was even offered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator will recall, when we had the joint committee, three from the Senate and three from the House, Senator DENEEN, Senator Sackett, and myself representing the Senate, we reached an agreement—the committee was not unanimous, however—on the United Power Co.'s bid. I announced at the time that I was not in favor of that bid, but that if the Cyanamid people would agree to make 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, then when the bill came up I would offer it as a substitute. They would not agree and did not agree, and I never did offer it.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course they did not agree, and one reason why they did not agree was because Chester Gray would not even ask them to agree to it. The farmers' representative, as the evidence shows, said, "I can get it through without it." He overestimated his power.

He was calling upon President Coolidge in this memorandum. What does it disclose? He asked him to take it up with two members of the House committee whom he mentions by name. Why did he mention nobody else? He had made an investigation and undoubtedly knew where the committee stood, and he called upon Coolidge to use his influence to control the Committee on Military Affairs, or two members of it, and get the bill reported out so as to give some standing to the Cyanamid bid and give some heart to Senator Willis, who was expected to offer it as a substitute for the bill that was reported by me from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Where has there been a Senator through all the debate who has had the courage to rise here and offer the Cyanamid bid? Never one, not one! No Member of the Senate has done it. Senators are convinced from the analysis which was made when the matter was pending heretofore that it is an obnoxious proposition, unfair, that it is deceptive to the farmers, full of jokers, and will not do what it is pretended it will do, but will inure to the benefit of the Power Trust, as the evidence shows.

If Mr. Thompson will take up the question in an honest way to find out what Mr. Gray has been doing in behalf of the farmers, I invite him to read in the New Republic of April 16 an article entitled "The Muscle Shoals Lobby," by Duff Gilfong. I am going to read just an extract or two from it. It is said in the article:

Why do the farmers support a company that is using them as a blind to acquire the power at Muscle Shoals for its own profit?

I submit that question to Mr. Thompson. I submit that question to every honest farmer in the American Farm Bureau Federation:

Why do the farmers support a company that is using them as a blind to acquire the power at Muscle Shoals for its own profit?

That is just what they are trying to do. That is what Chester Gray has been trying to do from the time the Cyanamid bid

came in. He was for the power companies and the Cyanamid Co. and for anything for any trust or monopoly that would give them the benefit of that remarkably cheap power down at Muscle Shoals.

I am not going to repeat my analysis of that bid which I have already made on at least two occasions in the Senate. It is sufficient to know that not a single Senator from the very beginning to the end has dared to offer that bid, although this great representative, "My dear Chester," was working for it all the time, although he had access to the White House, although he said that Coolidge was for it, that Hoover was for it, and that Smith was going to be for it, and that he was going to look after everybody; and yet he has not convinced a Senator with reference to it. He did at one time. He had some of them convinced at one time until that analysis was made, until it was shown that the Cyanamid bid was a fraud and a deception and had jokers in it. Although it was drawn for the Cyanamid Co. by the great lawyer who is now the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, nevertheless ordinary men were able to see through it and get the jokers and to expose them on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere.

The article continues:

Why do the farmers support a company that is using them as a blind to acquire the power at Muscle Shoals for its own profit? Because they don't know that Mr. Gray, who writes the resolutions which they trustfully accept at annual conventions, is fooling them. He says that the Cyanamid bid is their means of procuring cheap fertilizer, and they believe him, as the rank and file of the American Legion believe their leaders who tell them that the conscription bills before Congress conscript capital. They don't know the facts as they were brought out at the hearings: That Gray opposes amendments on the Muscle Shoals bills, not as they affect the farmers but as they affect the Cyanamid Co.; that he refused to allow the president of the Cyanamid Co. to submit to a more drastic recapture clause, which would certainly be to the advantage of the farmers; that R. F. Bower, who addressed them as a representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation at farmers' meetings, was paid by the Cyanamid Co. or its ally, the Tennessee River Improvement Association; that the pamphlets and circulars sent out by O. M. Kile for the American Farm Bureau Federation brought him \$725 a month from the Cyanamid Co. Do they know that when the little town of Muscle Shoals offered to buy power from the Government, Mr. Gray, the farmers' representative, promptly warned President Coolidge not to establish the bad precedent of Government dispensation of power? No power company could have been more perturbed. How could they suspect that their representative cooperated with the secretary of the National Fertilizer Co., which opposes the manufacture of fertilizer, naturally, but favors private operation of Muscle Shoals (and for a good reason)?

Further on the writer of the article says:

But the greatest display of obeisance a President could make to a lobbyist was the alteration of the presidential message to Congress at the lobbyist's dictum. Unluckily, Gray was out of town when an advance copy of the speech reached him. He promptly telegraphed to the President.

This is a quotation from the article. It is in the testimony, and I could read it from the testimony instead of reading it from this article; but this is what Gray wired the President when he found out what his message was going to be—he secured an advance copy; he was not here; and he wired the President:

At complete loss to understand paragraph on Muscle Shoals in view of your statement to us last Tuesday. Hope not too late to revise this paragraph so you can be free to aid Congressman Madden in passing his bill.

That is the telegram Gray sent to President Coolidge. The writer of the article then goes on to say:

Evidently it was never too late to consider the farmers' representative. Conferring with him by long-distance telephone, Mr. Sanders, the President's secretary, took from him a dictated revision of the paragraph. "Had I been in Washington," Gray wrote O'Neal early in January, 1928, "it might have been possible to have made a more accurate wording to suit us, but that was the best I could do in a very hasty and disturbed long-distance conversation."

That happened, Mr. President; it is in the testimony; I can turn to it now and read it from the testimony; but I thought I would read it from this article; it is the story told by Gray's letter to O'Neal, in which he told just what he did; how he had called the President's Private Secretary on the long-distance telephone after he had seen the advance copy of the President's message, and had the message changed. He boasts about it in the letter. The article concludes:

What prompted Mr. Gray to deceive the farmers and devote himself so fervently to the interests of the Cyanamid Co. has not yet been brought to light by the committee. But more important than Mr. Gray's incentives is the unhappy fate these revelations must bring to the secret ambitions of the American Cyanamid Co.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed in the RECORD the entire article from which I have been quoting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the New Republic, April 16, 1930]

#### THE MUSCLE SHOALS LOBBY—HOW THE CYANAMID CO. HAS HOODWINKED THE FARMERS

The future of the great Government plant at Muscle Shoals is still undecided. The power interests, represented by the Alabama Power Co., have long been trying to get hold of it. So has the American Cyanamid Co., which has asserted, in order to gain farmer support, that it wants to use the plant chiefly to make fertilizer. In its previous session, Congress passed Senator NORRIS's bill for Government operation, but President Coolidge killed it by a pocket veto. The Senate has again passed the bill, but even if the House does the same, President Hoover will probably reject it, and if he does, it is not certain that it could be repassed over his veto. Meanwhile, we are beginning to get some of the history of the intrigue which has heretofore blocked it.

Recent testimony before the Senate lobby investigating committee by a representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation, an organization of 1,000,000 farmers over the country, revealed how the White House has been eating out of the hand of this farmers' lobby in the matter of Muscle Shoals. The lobbyist, Chester H. Gray, admitted that he had influenced President Coolidge to stop the Department of Agriculture from writing a Muscle Shoals bill which he, Mr. Gray, did not like; that he had persuaded President Coolidge to assign his Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Herbert Hoover, to help Mr. Gray in putting over a Muscle Shoals bill he did like. Furthermore, he actually dictated the paragraph on Muscle Shoals in one of President Coolidge's messages to Congress. Strange that the big-business administration should have shown such respect for the desires of the farmer? Ah! but Mr. Gray was pushing the Cyanamid bid for Muscle Shoals, by which the Government turns over the people's property to a private company, promising to manufacture fertilizer for the farmer—and actually meaning to do nothing of the kind.

Aside from the argument of Senator NORRIS, who has gone over the situation with chemists, that the cyanamide process of manufacturing fertilizer is obsolete, newer methods having been devised, there is plenty of evidence that the American Cyanamid Co. is not leasing Muscle Shoals to manufacture fertilizer. Why should it? When Henry Ford bargained for Muscle Shoals some years ago, the president of the American Cyanamid Co. himself testified before the Committee on Military Affairs, before which the bill came up, that the value of this development was not in its fertilizer possibilities, but in its electric-power resources. The profits from the water power are so stupendous in comparison with the Cyanamid's proposed profit on the fertilizer that it is absurd to suppose that so great a business concern as the Cyanamid Co. would dedicate itself to such poor business.

Moreover, the recapture clause of the bid, which should provide for the Government's recovery of Muscle Shoals on the failure of the lessee to manufacture fertilizer, doesn't guarantee that at all. Drawn up by that great legal mind, Charles Evans Hughes, the recapture clause consists of 21 lines of whereases, provisos, and heretofores, which, translated into intelligible English, state that in 15 years (not until then, mind you), if the lessee is converting all the power at Muscle Shoals into profits and none into fertilizer, a board may (not must) file a complaint with the Secretary of War; that the matter is then to be submitted to arbitrators, who are to hold hearings; that if the arbitrators agree with the board that the suspension of the manufacture of fertilizer is likely to be permanent—no; the lease isn't canceled yet—the matter then is to be referred to the Secretary of War; that he is to refer it to Congress, which may acquit the company of the duty of making fertilizer; finally, in case Congress fails to act, the Secretary of War may acquit the company himself.

Senator BLACK, of Alabama, who is not a Government-operation man, but has committed himself to getting fertilizer for the farmer out of the nitrates at Muscle Shoals, said of the Madden-Wright bill, in which the Cyanamid offer is incorporated, "The bill, as now written, in my judgment, would not cause enough operation of the nitrate plants to remove the rust from the wheels."

Why do the farmers support a company that is using them as a blind to acquire the power at Muscle Shoals for its own profit? Because they don't know that Mr. Gray, who writes the resolutions which they trustfully accept at annual conventions, is fooling them. He says that the Cyanamid bid is their means of procuring cheap fertilizer, and they believe him, as the rank and file of the American Legion believe their leaders who tell them that the conscription bills before Congress con-



script capital. They don't know the facts as they were brought out at the hearings; that Gray opposes amendments on the Muscle Shoals bills; not as they affect the farmers but as they affect the Cyanamid Co.; that he refused to allow the president of the Cyanamid Co. to submit to a more drastic recapture clause, which would certainly be to the advantage of the farmers; that R. F. Bower, who addressed them as a representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation at farmers' meetings, was paid by the Cyanamid Co., or its ally the Tennessee River Improvement Association; that the pamphlets and circulars sent out by O. M. Kille for the American Farm Bureau Federation brought him \$725 a month from the Cyanamid Co. Do they know that when the little town of Muscle Shoals offered to buy power from the Government, Mr. Gray, the farmers' representative, promptly warned President Coolidge not to establish the bad precedent of Government dispensation of power? No power company could have been more perturbed. How could they suspect that their representative cooperated with the secretary of the National Fertilizer Co., which opposes the manufacture of fertilizer, naturally, but favors private operation of Muscle Shoals (and for a good reason)?

"Does the question come up as to what the farmers are thinking?" the credulous husbandmen read in the propaganda disseminated by the American Farm Bureau Federation. "Send for Gray," is the order, and Gray, speeding by taxi down the broad boulevard, arrives under the Capitol Dome to tell Congressmen and Senators just how their contemplated course will affect the farmers and what the probable reaction will be.

No inkling have they of shadowy maneuvers such as are revealed, for example, in a letter dated July 24, 1929, written by Mr. Gray to Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation. "Relative to your authorizing R. F. Bower to do some field work this summer and fall," says Gray, "in deflecting senatorial votes from the Norris resolution, I know the question which will be uppermost in your mind will be whether or not you, as president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation, desire to send out a member of the personnel when the finances to support him come from sources other than the regular income of your federation." And thereupon Mr. Gray reminds his colleague that the performance is not without precedent in their organization.

The blitheness with which their own leaders hoodwink the farmers undoubtedly relieved the White House conscience for doing likewise. So coveted a prize is farmers' support for a bill which sanctions private operation of a public property that President Coolidge could not resist it, even though it was given under an illusion. When Mr. Gray informed him in 1926 that the farmers would never support the bid of a power company for Muscle Shoals unless, like the American Cyanamid Co., it wore a chemical cloak, the President got the point. Moreover, he agreed with Gray that the man to effect a compromise between the power and the so-called "chemical interests," and thus insure the defeat of the Norris resolution for the Federal operation of Muscle Shoals, was his Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover. That Mr. Hoover made the attempt was brought out by correspondence at the hearings; but it failed.

The plan, however, was too good to abandon. Gray and his cohorts held conferences with the Alabama Power Co., while instructions from the president of the Cyanamid Co. poured in.

The Tennessee River Improvement Association, of which the distinguished Republican National Committee chairman, Claudius H. Huston, was president, came out loudly for the Cyanamid bid and quietly accepted money from the power companies. Recognizing the kinship of the enemy—after all, the Cyanamid Co. has no distributing system and would have to sell the power generated at Muscle Shoals to the power interests—and duly impressed with the farm appeal of the Cyanamid Co., the power companies withdrew their clamors for Muscle Shoals. It was a tacit agreement, Mr. Bell told Mr. Gray, entered into out of respect for our monopoly law. Through it everybody was to get his—except the unlucky electric-light user, who would have to pay a middleman's profit on his bills. Thus the Cyanamid bid came to be the outstanding opposition offer to Mr. Norris's resolution for Muscle Shoals.

In other ventures in behalf of the farmers and their interest in Muscle Shoals, the White House was more effective. Early in 1928, Chester Gray, prowling around in the Department of Agriculture, gathered that somebody was working on a Muscle Shoals bill based on the Government-operation idea. Immediately the farmers' representative thought of the American Cyanamid Co., and tore to the White House. Before he could finish his report of the dangerous activities at the Department of Agriculture—so Gray imparted to O'Neal—the President actually sent word that any effort to write a bill competitive to the Madden-Wright Muscle Shoals bill must cease until the department had conferred with him. "There is no doubt in my mind that the President is with us," wrote Gray, after the President's Secretary called him up to report the progress of the conference. The President had declared therein that "he wanted the Madden bill to have the right of way unobstructed," and the department had promised to write no more Muscle Shoals bills.

"Oh, yes; I had a very fine contact at the White House on the Muscle Shoals in the Coolidge administration," Gray boasted before the lobby committee.

"You mean you controlled the President?" asked Chairman CARAWAY.

"No; I conferred with him upon details as they came along, sometimes at my solicitation and sometimes at his."

"Two souls with but a single thought," suggested CARAWAY.

"That is it," agreed Gray, "poetically expressed."

But the greatest display of obeisance a President could make to a lobbyist was the alteration of the presidential message to Congress at the lobbyist's dictum. Unluckily, Gray was out of town when an advance copy of the speech reached him. He promptly telegraphed to the President: "At complete loss to understand paragraph on Muscle Shoals in view of your statement to us last Tuesday. Hope not too late to revise this paragraph so you can be free to aid Congressman Madden in passing his bill." Evidently it was never too late to consider the farmers' representative. Conferring with him by long-distance telephone, Mr. Sanders, the President's secretary, took from him a dictated revision of the paragraph. "Had I been in Washington," Gray wrote O'Neal early in January, 1928, "it might have been possible to have made a more accurate wording to suit us, but that was the best I could do in a very hasty and disturbed long-distance conversation."

Questioned by the lobby committee as to the assistance he had rendered President Hoover in connection with the Muscle Shoals section of his congressional message, Mr. Gray admitted that his help was not needed. "It was the best Muscle Shoals resolution," he explained, "that any President has ever written."

"He beat both of you?" asked Senator CARAWAY, referring to the partnership of Coolidge and Gray.

"He beat both of us," said Gray.

The "contact" in the Hoover administration is not as direct as it was in the preceding administration. It could, nevertheless, have been very considerable, as Col. J. W. Worthington, Mr. Huston's successor as president of the Tennessee River Improvement Association, recognized. Writing Mr. Gray after President Hoover's election, he advised him:

"Get Mr. Huston to introduce you to Mr. Horace Mann [Mr. Hoover's southern campaign manager] and to Mr. Richey [gum-shoe secretary to the President]. Huston, Mann, Richey, and Akerson (another secretary) are close contact men with Mr. Hoover. You can talk most freely to Mr. Huston (just as freely as you can talk to me) and you can get help from him. He knows all about the danger of Mr. JAMES's banditry. \* \* \* [This refers to the recalcitrancy of the Military Affairs Committee chairman in selling out on the public.] All together, the Madden bill is an inviting bridge for you to cross over to the Hoover presidential shore."

Before attaining his present eminent position, Mr. Huston had dispatched a letter to each Member of Congress urging him to accept the Cyanamid bid for Muscle Shoals. That he did not mean to fall short of expectations was recognized by Mr. Gray in a recent communication to Mr. O'Neal. "He is okay," wrote the former, "and is doing all that he dares to do in the position which he occupies. I learned that he is watching his step on this for fear of being called by CARAWAY's committee. We do not want to urge him to do too much right now on this account."

What prompted Mr. Gray to deceive the farmers and devote himself so fervently to the interests of the Cyanamid Co. has not yet been brought to light by the committee. But more important than Mr. Gray's incentives is the unhappy fate these revelations must bring to the secret ambitions of the American Cyanamid Co.

DUFF GILFORD.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is long past the usual hour of adjournment, and I have probably gone sufficiently far into this particular chapter as it affects Mr. Gray. I think it is additional evidence to what was offered when I referred to him previously; that, instead of representing the farmers of America, he has been deceiving them; he has been representing somebody who in reality is the enemy of the farmers. He was representing those who had submitted a bid that contained a joker, which those responsible for it hired the greatest legal talent in the United States which they could procure to write.

Mr. Gray discloses in the testimony before the lobby committee that he was in conference with the power interests. Reluctantly he testified to it; but, under the searching cross-examination of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK], he had finally to admit he was in conference with them; that he was in conference with Bell. When he was told that there was an agreement made between the Cyanamid Co. and the power interests, with Aylesworth, of the Power Trust, by which they were going to get a bill through, he endeavored to make Congress and the country believe that it was the cyanamide bill, when, as a matter of fact, a secret agreement existed between the Cyanamid Co. and the Power Trust that they would handle it according to that secret understanding when the measure was enacted; and when a proposition was made in

honesty and with the best of faith by Representative HILL to try to get a better offer from the Cyanamid Co., which Mr. HILL pleaded with Gray, the farmer's friend, to intercede in behalf of the farmers with Bell, to see if he could not get him to make his offer a little better for the farmers, he refused to do it, on the ground that he had influence enough to get the bill through as it was.

If Mr. Thompson now can get any satisfaction out of that kind of a representative here, if the Farm Bureau of the United States want to have that kind of a man represent them before the committees of the Senate and the House it is their privilege to do so. He is in disgrace with every Member of the Senate, no matter where that Senator stands on the question of the disposition of Muscle Shoals or on any other proposition, for every man of common honesty knows, no matter what his belief may be as to Muscle Shoals, that Chester Gray has not only deceived the farmers but he has deceived the Senate, and he has misrepresented the facts to the Agricultural Committee. He did it when he was not under oath, and the only thing that now prevents him from looking through the bars for perjury is that he did not happen to be sworn on that occasion.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in open session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business in open session.

#### TREATY—STATUS OF ALIENS

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate on last evening ratified the treaty, Executive HH, may be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the treaty was ratified is reconsidered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have asked that the vote whereby the treaty was ratified be reconsidered for the purpose of changing the resolution of ratification. The change proposed will not affect the intent, but the expression which was used in the resolution of ratification yesterday, in my opinion, is not in proper form. It provided for the striking out of two articles. I have changed it so as to ratify the treaty with the exception of those two articles in the treaty.

I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive HH (70th Cong., 2d sess.), convention regarding the status of aliens, adopted at the Sixth International Conference of American States, assembled at Habana, January 16 to February 20, 1928, which had been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike out articles 3 and 4.

The treaty was read.

(For text of treaty see page 7059 of the RECORD of April 15, 1930.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The treaty was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution of ratification submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification, with the exception of articles 3 and 4 thereof, of Executive HH, Seventieth Congress, second session, a convention on the status of aliens in American states adopted February 20, 1928, at the Sixth International Conference of American States, at Habana, Cuba.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty as amended? [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is adopted and the treaty is ratified.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. McNARY. I move that the post-office nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the post-office nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 17, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of April 14), 1930*

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Stella M. Stallworth, Chapman.

##### ARIZONA

Charles F. Mater, Morenci.  
Mary W. Hand, Winkelman.

##### ARKANSAS

James H. Elkins, Blytheville.  
Oscar W. McClintock, Monticello.  
Shafter A. King, Salem.  
Joseph T. Todd, Smithville.

##### CALIFORNIA

Alvin L. Woodin, Atascadero.  
Lena E. Reed, Ludlow.  
Joseph A. Schweinitzer, Martinez.  
William F. Knight, Pasadena.  
John R. Chace, San Jose.

##### COLORADO

Mary H. Cowie, Boulder.  
William J. Orr, Leadville.  
Robert R. Finley, Loveland.  
Mary McConnell, Minturn.  
Gwendolyn Oyler, Pritchett.

##### CONNECTICUT

Helen G. Miller, Coscob.  
Anders Jacobsen, Stafford Springs.  
William P. Gourlie, Thompsonville.

##### IDAHO

Joseph Morley, Idaho Falls.  
Guy Swain, Roselake.

##### ILLINOIS

Emma H. Paine, Alpha.  
Carl A. Helwig, Blue Island.  
Henry C. Norcross, Carlyle.  
Edgar C. Seik, Grafton.  
Arthur F. Eberlin, Hardin.  
Lacey D. Irwin, Kane.  
Ira L. Heern, Makanda.  
William K. McDaniel, Martinsville.  
Henry W. Schilling, Noble.  
Asa L. Kiser, Pittsfield.  
Roy C. Tarrant, Versailles.

##### INDIANA

Ethel J. Pinney, La Crosse.  
Joseph D. Bartlett, La Fayette.  
Stephen M. Isom, Mitchell.  
Harry Kretschman, Otterbein.

##### IOWA

John L. Gallagher, Eddyville.  
Earl E. Shibley, Lone Tree.  
Harold A. Marmon, Mitchellville.  
Frank M. Abbott, Osceola.  
Andrew F. Parker, Redding.

##### KANSAS

Harry T. Hill, Colony.  
Mae Boyd, Dorrance.  
George D. Gibson, Edmond.  
Benjamin F. Liebst, Greeley.  
Clare J. Anderson, Gypsum.  
Elva M. Woodward, Haviland.  
Grace Wilson, Hoxie.  
Floyd B. Martin, Lane.  
Otto L. Walmer, Lucas.  
Fred T. Elliot, Morrill.



Ralph E. Ellison, Muscotah.  
William F. Greer, St. Francis.  
Reuben W. Walquist, Savonburg.

## MAINE

Mae L. Jack, Denmark.  
Etta S. Maddocks, Dryden.

## MICHIGAN

Henry M. Cosier, Bear Lake.  
Benjamin F. Scamehorn, Bloomingdale.  
Herbert E. McElheny, Gobles.  
Harold Stecker, Hermansville.  
Amos H. Crosby, New Buffalo.  
Jesse M. Green, Roscommon.  
John M. Klipp, Watervliet.

## MISSISSIPPI

Mary A. Stapleton, Clinton.  
Annie Laws, Hickory Flat.  
Kathleen J. Martin, Louise.  
Marion W. Thornton, Pachuta.  
Robert R. Smith, Poplarville.

## MISSOURI

Archie C. Atterberry, Atlanta.  
Laura G. McKay, Troy.  
Wilbur N. Osborne, Williamsville.

## MONTANA

Leon E. Phillips, Highwood.  
Rose M. Sargent, Nashua.  
Letta Conser, Plevna.  
Marie I. Moler, Reedpoint.

## NEBRASKA

Alvin O. Jones, Adams.  
Daniel B. Dick, Cambridge.  
John T. Bierbower, Giltner.  
Howard L. Sergeant, Juniata.  
Minnie Johansen, Loup City.  
Edith R. Hunt, Niobrara.  
Clarence Rosecrans, Odell.  
Rolland C. Shetler, Riverton.  
Stewart J. Kennedy, St. Edward.  
Philip J. Seefus, Scotia.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Raymond E. Kelley, Center Harbor.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Henry B. Head, Caroleen.  
Thomas R. Sparrow, Hillsboro.  
A. Eugene Ward, Lake Junaluska.  
John M. Joyce, Madison.  
Charlie L. Walters, Mayodan.

## OHIO

Helen M. Roley, Basil.  
Albert E. Gale, Lima.  
Harry E. Hawley, Mansfield.  
Edward W. Williams, New Carlisle.  
Monto B. Coffin, New Vienna.  
Edwin M. Stover, Oakwood.  
Francis M. Hiett, Spring Valley.  
Jesse A. Hayes, Stockport.  
Elmer E. Garner, Tiltonsville.  
George W. Smith, Wheelersburg.

## OREGON

Frank L. Laughrige, Condon.  
Ralph R. Huron, La Grande.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Lois Hill, Baden.  
Ira R. Burns, Bellwood.  
Charles S. Bentley, Corry.  
Herman L. Levy, Daisytown.  
Anna M. Hess, Duncansville.  
James W. Hatch, North Girard.  
Frank A. Householder, Oakmont.  
John F. Harshey, Penn.  
Daniel S. Gressang, Pottsville.  
Herbert M. Black, West Sunbury.

## RHODE ISLAND

George W. Burgess, Pawtucket.

## VIRGINIA

Charles E. D. Burtis, Bumpass.  
Harvey W. Nester, Fieldale.  
Henry H. Hardenbergh, Fredericks Hall.

Lacy C. Alphin, Hot Springs.  
William R. Berry, Meherrin.  
Raymond D. Williams, Pembroke.

## WASHINGTON

George D. Montfort, Blaine.  
Leonidas I. Wakefield, Elma.  
Mary A. Johns, Kalama.  
Helen L. Hadenfeldt, Mukilteo.  
Allan Austin, Onalaska.  
George F. Thomas, Retsil.  
Lawrence C. McLean, Selleck.  
May V. Garrison, Sumas.  
H. Robert Nelson, Wilkeson.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Henry N. Murphy, Anawalt.  
Hattie Brown, Bramwell.  
Harper B. Kinzer, Ethel.  
Mary E. Hill, Mabscott.  
Raymond Walls, Man.  
Easter Y. Shafer, Rupert.  
Jesse H. Miller, Switchback.

## WYOMING

Charles A. Ackenhausen, Worland.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O Lord, for Thou wert the God of our fathers. Thou didst teach them many things, and their trust in Thee was not in vain. May we seek the same truths and be led by the same light. Whatever we may need in the midst of our doubts and our longings, do Thou provide. O Thou who art infinite in nature and the one altogether lovely, be with us to-day, that we may be zealous in all good works and our aspirations be as a flaming fire. We are so thankful that Thou art at the center of all power, aye, at the very heart of the universe, yet Thou art eternal midday and eternal joy. We rejoice in Thee, our Father, for Him who held eternity's secret in His untroubled breast and carried it calmly into the hush of the night of death. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3783. An act for the relief of the State of Georgia for damage to and destruction of roads and bridges by floods in 1929.

## SWEARING IN A MEMBER

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to present to the House Representative-elect MARTIN J. KENNEDY, from the eighteenth congressional district of New York, who succeeds Hon. John F. Carew, resigned. Mr. KENNEDY's credentials are filed and in proper form, and he is ready to take the oath.

Mr. KENNEDY, accompanied by Mr. CULLEN, appeared before the Speaker's rostrum and took the oath of office.

## ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the special session of Congress started about one year ago, I urged upon this House the desirability of going on record in favor of the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway project as soon as a treaty with Canada could be negotiated. I urged action at that time on H. J. Res. 37, introduced by Congressman McLEOD, of Michigan, and on H. R. 733, a bill introduced by Congressman MAPES, of Michigan. I, again, want to say that the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway is a matter of national importance, of vital concern to the producer, and to the consumer. The problem of cheaper transportation affects the welfare of

all our people. As a program of farm relief, this project means much to the agricultural sections of America.

For some reason, strange, mysterious, or otherwise, while Congress has been in session, this great undertaking has been given no place in our legislative program. Other matters have claimed attention. Steps looking toward a canal across Nicaragua have been taken, in the interests of some sections of our country. No such progress has been seen on the St. Lawrence waterway matter. We have heard much about river transportation, and river channels, and canals, and inland transportation, but there has been a golden silence on the St. Lawrence waterway project, an undertaking of larger possibilities and more benefit to our people than the Panama Canal.

I do not need to go into detail as to the vast changes that this project would make possible. It would give to the great Northwest, with over 40,000,000 people an ocean port, and would bring to them the benefits of ocean transportation. It would work to the advantage of Canada. It would benefit New England, and the leading economists of that section so testify. The Great Lakes cities and inland towns would feel its beneficent influence. The ground has been covered many times.

A great engineer, and then Secretary of Commerce, said in 1927, speaking of this project:

I have had the honor to serve during the past three years as chairman of the President's commission upon the St. Lawrence waterway. In cooperation with the Canadian authorities we have undertaken an exhaustive investigation of the economic and engineering problems. In accord with the compelling interpretation of the facts, our American commission has recommended that its construction be undertaken. It would remove a great barrier to world transportation. It is urgent to the prosperity of the vast Mid West. It will contribute to relief of many of its postwar difficulties. It will contribute a wealth of hydroelectric power. It is a task worthy of the strength and purpose of the two sister nations who have in two centuries already overcome countless obstacles in implanting the most hopeful civilization of history.

Among impartial students of the question, there has never been any question as to the feasibility or practicability of the St. Lawrence waterway plan. The best engineers are all agreed on this point. This same outstanding man further said:

Our engineers have determined full plans by which we can ultimately secure a 30-foot channel admitting to the Lakes 88 per cent of all ocean-going vessels which touch North American ports—and, thus, great cities like Fort William, Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, and Toronto may take their place and part as the seaboard of the world.

While the works to convert the St. Lawrence to a shipway must be on a stupendous scale—the greatest engineering project of modern history—yet they are comparatively simple in character as are most great things. It is proposed that we shall construct three or four big dams across the St. Lawrence River and thus transform its rapids into great pools, the passing of which by appropriate locks and canals make the shipway.

And so I might cite page after page from authorities on the question, all pointing to the fact that the St. Lawrence waterway project is proper. These authorities include the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, the report of the commission appointed by the President in 1924, book on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Ship Channel by Alfred H. Ritter, book on New England and the St. Lawrence Seaway by Henry I. Harriman.

But on this proposition, as on all matters of national importance, sectionalism enters, and presents an obstacle. I refer to the plan known as the "All-American route." This means the Erie Canal through the State of New York. The defeat of the St. Lawrence waterway plan has been sought for years by means of effective propaganda. Its substitute offered as "just as good or better" has to do with a plan to deepen the Erie Canal across New York State, and forget about the St. Lawrence plan. I do not oppose any inland waterway or its development or its enlargement. But I am opposed to this "All-American substitute." This substitute plan is objectionable. Those objections can not be overcome. They have been pointed out time after time. They are well known to everyone. There is nothing offered which will compare with the advantages of the St. Lawrence waterway plan. This same distinguished engineer, in discussing the so-called All-American route through New York State, also said:

There are groups of our citizens who sincerely believe that we should develop this outlet to the sea solely within our own boundaries by deepening of the Erie Canal to a depth of 30 feet. \* \* \* Our Army engineers have made exhaustive examination of the New York route. If it were constructed wholly upon American soil, it would cost over \$630,000,000. If it were constructed on the shorter route from Oswego to Albany it would not be an All-American route, for ships would then need to pass through the Canadian Welland Canal around

Niagara. In this case, it would cost \$500,000,000. In neither case would there be any electrical power developed.

The construction of the St. Lawrence route after realization of the power may recover its entire cost but in any event intermediate plans imply a cost of less than one-third the shortest New York route. There are also navigation questions which render the St. Lawrence a more economical transport route than the New York line. It brings all mid-America 600 miles nearer to Europe than by the New York route. The New York route would require slow navigation through 128 miles of canals against 21 miles of canals along the St. Lawrence. There would be stops for 20 locks and 54 bridges on the New York route, whereas the St. Lawrence route would have stops for 9 locks and 8 bridges.

I call attention to these unanswerable facts because no program should be permitted in Congress that will interfere with this project. Political expediency should not be allowed to cast aside this great St. Lawrence waterway plan. The advocates of the all-American route should understand clearly and positively that the people of the United States are against any sectional program that has a contrary purpose. The St. Lawrence waterway plan is too important to the Nation for prejudice and jealousy to dictate that the wrong and improper thing be done.

When I say this, let there be no misunderstanding as to my attitude relative to the development of our inland waterways. I favor waterway development whether it be on the Illinois River, the Erie Canal, or the 9-foot channel on the Mississippi.

But those projects should not be at the expense of the St. Lawrence waterway. There is no duty on the part of those who advocate those improvements to remain silent on the St. Lawrence question. It means much to them. Their constituents are interested in its success.

I know that the opponents of the St. Lawrence waterway will cheerfully say that there is no possibility of any international action; that the United States and Canada will not come to an agreement; and that the proposition is still a dream. I deny this. I have kept in close touch with friends in Canada, and they freely admit that politics and prejudice have played an important part in the delay that has taken place. They have in Canada their "all American" subterfuge, called by other names, the same as we have in the United States. They have their sectionalism and jealousy, the same as we have in the United States. The Canadian newspapers will enlighten you fully on these matters. I quote from a recent newspaper editorial from Canada:

The St. Lawrence waterway proposition is beginning to force itself to the front as a public issue of first-class magnitude. For the past two or three years there has been much political jockeying in reference to this question. The motives behind these tactics have always been somewhat obscure. \* \* \*

The editorial then goes on to discuss the proposition and to explain those motives. It further gives reasons why the delay tactics of the past will soon give way to the demand of the Canadian people for action on the St. Lawrence waterway. We know that the two governments are carrying on negotiations. I only touch upon the question to show that information from Canada indicates that the future is bright with promise.

But what about the developments in our House of Representatives? In March the Rivers and Harbors Committee had before it the Assistant Chief of Engineers of the War Department. Pressure was brought to bear upon him by members of the committee to have him recommend that the United States take over from the State of New York the Oswego and Erie Canals. He was asked to recommend an authorized expenditure of some \$26,000,000 for the purpose of deepening and improving those projects. At the same time he was requested to recommend that the Federal Government take over the Illinois waterway and make expenditures thereon of some \$7,000,000. Later representatives from these two States appeared before the Board of Engineers of the War Department and renewed their demands. Illinois was willing to battle for New York and New York stood nobly in the front line of battle for the Illinois program. Here, indeed, was a magnificent spectacle of political jockeying. It was a splendid example of reciprocity. The appeal was irresistible. Within a week there was a favorable report to the Rivers and Harbors Committee from the Chief of Engineers on both of these plans. Thereupon the Rivers and Harbors Committee promptly incorporated in the proposed bill the necessary legislative language.

In this connection it should be noted that the 9-foot channel for the upper Mississippi has not fared so well. In fact, it has been entirely ignored.

For some reason, enough pressure could not be brought upon the War Department, and the Board of Engineers have not recommended an authorization for the 9-foot channel in the



upper Mississippi River. Consequently, the Rivers and Harbors Committee has followed its usual procedure and has refused to consider the 9-foot channel in the absence of a favorable recommendation from the War Department.

In has long been the practice of the Rivers and Harbors Committee not to recommend new projects for legislative action by the House until full investigation has been made by the War Department and its favorable report submitted to the committee.

This little obstacle of an unfavorable report, or, rather, no report at all from the War Department on the Illinois project and on the New York projects had to be overcome. The War Department had to yield to pressure, and it did yield to pressure from these powerful combinations. Practical politics is a wonderful thing. There is magic in it.

So this House will be face to face with a bill reported by the Rivers and Harbors Committee which marks the beginning of a scheme for an "all-American" route. They plan a channel across the State of New York deep enough only to permit lake boats to come to Albany and New York harbors, but not deep enough for ocean ships to pass into the Great Lakes. There is perfect harmony in the State of New York. On April 8, 1930, the governor of that State called attention to the report of our Army engineers and recommended that appropriate action be taken by the State legislature to negotiate with the Federal Government as soon as the rivers and harbors bill should become a law. The governor frankly admits that this plan will commit the Federal Government to a deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea by way of the Hudson River.

No time was lost after the governor's message to the Legislature of the State of New York by the proponents of the "All American" waterway scheme. On April 9, 1930, House Joint Resolution No. 295 made its appearance in the House of Representatives, and provides for a joint committee to bring about the transfer of the New York State Barge Canal to the Federal Government. The resolution recites that "a new interest has developed throughout the country in the building of a canal to accommodate vessels of large tonnage moving between the Great Lakes and the Hudson River, and to be constructed wholly within the United States territory."

In 1871 the municipality of Duluth, Minn., sent a delegation to Congress to call attention to the importance of a St. Lawrence seaway project. Their efforts were blocked at that time by the proponents of the all-American route. Sectionalism played its part. It has again assumed the rôle of dictator. Now and here is the time and place for the friends of the St. Lawrence waterway to take a positive stand for that project and place it first in importance in any plans of waterway development. The path of its progress should not be closed. It is time that the great inland empire of this country had measured out to it the common justice to which it is entitled. This is said in no unkind spirit, and our short-sighted neighbors who oppose the St. Lawrence development will benefit more and more from the increased prosperity of the interior of the continent which would come from the waterway, then they will lose from the diversion of traffic now going through their harbors. We can not avoid the fact that the St. Lawrence waterway is the greatest national project before this House.

H. R. 11284

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill H. R. 11284.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, on April 1 last I introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 11284, which reads as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, subject to the approval of the President, is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, and to contract for the erection thereon of a fireproof hospital for the accommodation of 550 bed patients (with necessary auxiliary structures, mechanical equipment, approach work, roads, and trackage facilities leading thereto, domiciliary and outpatient dispensary facilities, facilities for a diagnostic center, and accommodations for officers, nurses, and attending personnel) and to acquire necessary vehicles, livestock, furniture, equipment, and accessories. The Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau is authorized to accept gifts or donations for any of the purposes named herein.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, the President is authorized to require the architectural, engineering, construction, or other forces of any department or agency of the Government to render aid and assistance, and he is further authorized to employ individuals and agencies not connected with the Government,

if in his opinion such employment is desirable, at such compensation as he may consider reasonable.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in order to carry out the provisions of this act, the sum of \$2,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended; and not to exceed 3 per cent of such sum shall be available for the employment in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, at the customary rates of compensation, of necessary technical and clerical assistance exclusively to aid in the preparation of the plans and specifications for the project authorized herein and for the supervision of the execution thereof, and for travel expenses, field equipment, and supplies in connection therewith.

There is at the present time located in the city of Cincinnati one of the three diagnostic centers established for the treatment and diagnosis of various disabilities and diseases of the World War veterans. The underlying reason for the location of the diagnostic center at Cincinnati was the recommendation of this location by the Medical Counsel of the United States Veterans' Bureau. This counsel is composed of outstanding specialists in the various branches of medicine throughout the United States. The counsel, at its first meeting in 1924, realized the necessity for the establishment of such centers, and decided to locate one of them at Cincinnati. Our great city is a medical center. It has proved to the entire country that diagnostic centers are necessary. It has successfully operated for more than five years the first diagnostic center to be established by the Veterans' Bureau. Approximately 3,000 medical-problem cases from all over the United States have cleared the center. The University of Cincinnati's medical staff, which to-day ranks second to none in the entire country, has been appointed in the capacity of consultants to the Center, and these doctors have proven their ability to do work as a unit in ferreting out the cause and nature of the bureau's obscure medical problems. It is these medical specialists from the University of Cincinnati that have made the Diagnostic Center a success, and they are willing to continue to make it a success. The Diagnostic Center is located at the Cincinnati General Hospital, in rented quarters, and the medical staff is working under a considerable handicap because the hospital can only spare a 30-bed ward. Their capacity for supplying laboratory service is also limited, since the city patients must be adequately served.

A 50-bed unit as provided for in my bill as a part of the proposed 550-bed hospital would make it possible to carefully study 1,000 of the bureau's medical problems per annum. The hospital laboratory should be equipped with all modern diagnostic appliances sufficient not only for the study of the hospital patients but should be available for the special use of the diagnostic center unit and should be so placed that it would be readily accessible for the center's specialistic service, and, by so doing, a great deal of money may be saved the Government.

Recommendations as to medical and surgical care made by the consultant specialists of the center add greatly to the expense, because when the patients are returned to their homes they must, in many instances, be sent to hospitals at Government expense for this care, which means a duplication of transportation cost and inconvenience to the patient. As an illustration, in one State, over a period of one year, 892 veterans, in order to obtain hospital treatment, were compelled to travel a total of approximately 660,000 miles at Government expense. It would be very much more satisfactory to the patient, when special medical or surgical care is recommended, to have it successfully concluded under the same roof, where the specialist who made the recommendations would be available in a supervisory capacity. It would also be advantageous to the consultant as well as to the patient to note the progress and watch the results while the recommended treatment was being carried out.

Having the diagnostic center's consultant staff of nationally known specialists so intimately connected with a veterans' hospital would be of tremendous benefit, in a medical way, to the hospital staff.

The diagnostic center is an important adjunct to the Veterans' Bureau, and from the excellent service record of the Cincinnati Center it is apparent that it is all important that the Government should locate a hospital in Cincinnati to properly house it.

The urgent need for hospitals to hospitalize ex-service men is recognized by the people of the United States to such an extent that it constitutes an emergency. This statement of fact is well known by every person who has studied the ex-service men's problems, such as the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau and representatives of the various ex-service men's organizations.

The representatives of such organizations in Cincinnati have for some time given careful consideration to the needs of hospital facilities for the ex-service men in Greater Cincinnati,



and have continuously urged the introduction of legislation to provide for the construction of a hospital to contain 500 beds for general purposes, as well as to house the diagnostic center and the Veterans' Bureau Regional Office, both of which are now located in Cincinnati. H. R. 11284 will cover these needs, and the Robert E. Bentley Post, American Legion, at Cincinnati, Ohio, adopted the following resolution indorsing this bill:

It has come to the attention of Robert E. Bentley Post, No. 50, American Legion, Department of Ohio, that Congressman and Legionnaire WILLIAM E. HESS, of the second district of Ohio, has introduced a bill known as H. R. 11284, requesting Congress to build in the city of Cincinnati a 550-bed hospital for veterans. At the regular meeting of Robert E. Bentley Post held on April 8, 1930, by unanimous vote, the following resolution was passed:

*Resolved*, That the Robert E. Bentley Post, realizing the urgent need for a hospital, use its influence and efforts to assist Legionnaire HESS in this commendable project, and that a committee be appointed by the Post to assist in this most worthy cause.

*Further be it resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman NICHOLAS LONGWORTH, from the First District of Ohio, and to Senator SIMON D. FESS, of Ohio, urging their support and assistance.

The question to be determined is where the hospitals should be located so they can best serve the ex-service men. In my opinion, many factors enter into determining the location of hospitals, but to my mind the two outstanding features are, first, where service can best be rendered, and, second, the cost. You will note I put "service" before "cost," because I am of the firm opinion that the people of the United States desire, as often expressed by Congress that the Government shall give to its ex-service men the best hospital service obtainable, and, second, at a cost commensurate with the service rendered.

With this thought in mind, I believe that the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, has many advantages which would make for a desirable location for a general hospital of 500 beds, a diagnostic center of 50 beds, and sufficient space to house the United States Veterans' Bureau Regional Office, all consolidated in one building but to be three separate and distinct units.

It is conservatively estimated that in Greater Cincinnati, which includes the cities of Norwood, Elmwood Place, and Cheviot, Ohio, and Covington, Newport, and Dayton, Ky., there are 30,000 ex-service men, and within a radius of 50 miles of Cincinnati, it is estimated that there are 50,000 veterans, who are all potential patients for this hospital. The geographical location of Cincinnati is such that it is only a few miles from the center of population, so it seems very logical to take the hospital to the veteran, rather than to take the veteran to the hospital.

Located in the city of Cincinnati is the Medical School of the University of Cincinnati, which is on a par with any other medical school in the country, and the city has some of the outstanding medical men of the country, which gives Cincinnati the proper medical background for a real hospital.

The medical men of this city have been unselfish in their co-operation with the Government, giving of their time and skill in assisting the ex-service men in getting proper diagnosis for the purpose of aiding them in adjusting their claims. I may say, without hesitation, that if the hospital is located in this city, these medical men will give to this institution, without stint, the benefit of their knowledge and skill.

Immediately after the close of the war the Government negotiated contracts in this area with the Cincinnati General Hospital, the Rockhill Sanatorium, and Longview Hospital for some hospital service and established United States Veterans' Hospital No. 69 at Fort Thomas, Ky. These contracts were never satisfactory to the Government, nor was the service satisfactory to the men, with the one exception of United States Veterans' Hospital No. 69, where the service was very good, but the lease was not satisfactory to the Government, and it was canceled, and all hospital contracts, with the exception of the Diagnostic Center, were canceled, leaving this densely populated district without Government hospital facilities. The only hospital facilities in this district at the present time are at the Cincinnati General Hospital, for emergency-connected cases, and only then for such a time until it is possible for the patients to be removed to a Government hospital.

It appears to be the intent of Congress at this time to liberalize section 202-10 of the veterans' act, and yet here is a densely populated section without any hospital facilities for connected cases, without even considering the cases which come under section 202-10, making a most deplorable condition, which, in my opinion, can be remedied by the passage of H. R. 11284.

The economic side, or the second phase of this subject, must be given proper consideration. Cincinnati being a railroad center, is easily reached by all classes of transportation, and being in the heart of a densely populated community, I sincerely

believe that the saving in railroad transportation alone should have great weight in causing a hospital to be located here.

We are now confronted with the situation where we send our men from this locality to the nearest general hospital, which is the Edward Hines Hospital in Chicago. This item of expense alone would be a great saving to the Government because we could place the men from Greater Cincinnati in this hospital at practically no cost to the Government for transportation.

I note the Veterans' Bureau states:

That the per capita cost for railroad transportation of ex-service men to the hospitals in 1929 was \$9.60.

And it is further stated that—

During the fiscal year 1929 it was necessary to curtail the calling in of beneficiaries for rating purposes in order that sufficient funds might be diverted to travel for hospitalization.

There are over 25,000 claims in the Cincinnati regional office to-day, all of whom are potential patients, and of this 25,000, 600 are now receiving out-patient treatment. This load is ever increasing, and it is carefully estimated that more than 20,000 of these men are located within a radius of 50 miles of Cincinnati. Taking the established railroad rate of 3.6 cents per mile, the majority of these men could be transported to Cincinnati at an average cost of \$1.80 per capita.

It is further noted that of the 9,000 men drawing checks from the Cincinnati regional office, 2,000 are living in the city of Cincinnati, and 1,500 are living in northern Kentucky. More than one-third of the beneficiaries are living within a 10-cent car fare of the proposed hospital.

Since it is the tendency of the Government to consolidate its many activities, I am sure if the general hospital, the diagnostic center, and the regional office were all housed in a Government building, the saving in rent would be equal to interest on more than a million dollars. Further, if this consolidation were effected, I believe that practically all of the examinations for the regional office could be made in the hospital, which would release the doctors now connected with the regional office, and make them available for duty on the hospital staff. This, in itself, would be a great saving in money.

Cincinnati is located in an industrial center, surrounded by a large agricultural area, so that supplies of all kinds could be procured for the hospital at a minimum cost.

With the civic and patriotic spirit which exists in Cincinnati, in addition to the other advantages enumerated here, I am of the firm belief that this city is admirably suited for the hospital which is contemplated in H. R. 11284, and if this hospital is erected in our city, Congress and the people of the United States may rest assured that the veterans treated there will be given the care and consideration which the people of our Nation want them to have.

#### THE LONDON NAVAL ARMS CONFERENCE

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief statement of the President, made on April 11, on the London conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

#### STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT HOOVER

I am greatly pleased with the final success of the naval arms conference in London and I have to-day telegraphed the delegation expressing my approval of the result achieved and my admiration for their patience and determination in an arduous and difficult negotiation. And I wish to congratulate the delegations of the other governments for their constructive and courageous action.

The most vital feature of its great accomplishments for peace is the final abolition of competition in naval arms between the greatest naval powers and the burial of the fears and suspicions which have been the constant product of rival warship construction. It will be recalled that prior to the 3-power conference at Geneva in 1927, which France and Italy felt obliged to decline attendance, there was naval competition in all craft except battleships, with constant international friction. Consequently, upon the failure of that conference, the rival expansion received even new impulses and resulted in increased international suspicion and ill-will through the world and a steady drift to greatly increased navies.

When I initiated this negotiation it was after a critical examination of the experience before and after the Geneva conference and a determination that the causes of that failure could be met with adequate preparation and preliminary negotiation. At that time we realized, and have realized at all times since, that the particular setting of the continental nations, because of the inseparable importance of land armies in their bearing upon naval strength, together with the political agree-



ments that reduction of such arms implied, made a 5-power agreement extremely improbable, as the United States could not involve itself in such agreements. The French and Italian Governments have shown the utmost good will in this conference in endeavor, in the interests of world peace, to support the present solution just as far as they could do so, and they have joined the present agreement in important provisions.

It is difficult to estimate the precise reductions in warcraft tonnage which has been brought about by this agreement because of the factor of normal replacement and additional tonnage authorized but not yet constructed. Nine battleships are to be scrapped of a total of about 230,000 tons, the replacement of 16 or 17 others to be deferred for six years. The various navies in the agreement are to reduce some 300,000 to 400,000 tons of other categories in the next few years as they become obsolete—but some categories of some of them must be increased in order to come up to the standards set. The net balance will be a very considerable decrease in the world's actual tonnage as it stands to-day.

The economic importance of the accomplishment can best be measured in terms of the situation developed at the Geneva conference. That conference broke down upon the feeling of the British representatives that it was necessary for them to create or maintain a navy of a total of nearly 1,500,000 tons. Their pre-war navy was much larger than this. The American delegates were not able to agree to this basis, as it implied such a huge amount of naval construction in the United States that it was hopeless to expect public support, and it meant a perpetually inferior navy.

The British suggestions at Geneva were approximately—

1. Maintain the battleships as provided in the Washington treaty, of which the British Battle Fleet then stood at 606,000 tons and the American Battle Fleet of 525,000 tons.

2. Aircraft carriers as in the Washington treaty, at a maximum of 135,000 tons.

3. A cruiser tonnage of about 450,000 tons in 70 cruisers.

4. Although actual figures were little discussed, the conversations appear to have indicated a destroyer tonnage of about 225,000 to 250,000 tons and a submarine tonnage of about 75,000 tons, or a total fleet of nearly 1,500,000 tons on a British basis, or 1,420,000 American basis, owing to our inferiority in battleship tonnage through the Washington arms treaty.

If this fleet had been adopted as the basis of parity, it would have cost the United States somewhere, upon different calculations, from \$1,400,000,000 to \$1,750,000,000 for replacements and new construction to attain it, with greatly increased maintenance costs.

The present agreement calls for parity of American and British fleets of approximately—

1. A battleship basis to each of us of about 460,000 tons, but no replacements for next six years on either side.

2. Aircraft carriers as in Washington arms treaty at a maximum of 135,000 tons.

3. A cruiser basis of 339,000 tons if the United States exercises the option of the same types as Great Britain, but, if the United States builds a larger ratio of the large cruisers, our tonnage would be 323,000. It represents a reduction of about 20 ships in the basis of the British cruisers fleet.

4. Destroyer tonnage of 150,000 tons and a submarine tonnage of 52,700 tons each.

That is a total fleet basis of, roughly, about 1,136,000 tons (slightly less if we build the larger cruisers) as compared with about 1,500,000 tons British basis of the Geneva conference, shows a reduction of about 364,000 tons below that basis to the United States and Great Britain and a proportional reduction to Japan. In bringing this about the British scrap four 8-inch gun cruisers and five battleships, while we scrap three battleships, thus bringing about parity in battleships which was not attained in the Washington agreement. The Japanese Navy, under the proposed agreement, will amount to something near 800,000 tons. These results are to be arrived at by scrapping, by obsolescence, and by construction in some categories prior to 1936 when a renewed conference is to take place.

The cost to the United States of replacements and new construction during the next six years, until the further conference, will be (under various estimates) from \$550,000,000 to \$650,000,000 as compared to a sum, as I have said, of between \$1,400,000,000 to \$1,750,000,000 to attain parity on the Geneva basis. To this latter would need be added the additional cost of maintenance and operating, which would make the saving upon the present basis, as compared to the Geneva, up to \$1,000,000,000 in the next six years.

The savings are not alone to the United States but to Great Britain and Japan as well. The total savings to the world is perhaps \$2,500,000,000 below the Geneva basis to which the world was steadily drifting. This sum devoted to reproductive enterprise will be a great stimulus to world prosperity.

There are no political undertakings of any kind in the present treaty, except an agreement for the regulation of the conduct of submarines against merchant ships in time of war. The whole agreement is a great step in world peace and an assurance of American parity in naval strength.

#### ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT HOOVER

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the address by President Hoover before the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the address made by President Hoover at the convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of President Hoover at the Thirty-ninth Continental Congress, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., April 14, 1930.

The address is as follows:

To the Daughters of the American Revolution: It is a pleasure to take part in welcoming the delegates from all parts of the country of so great a patriotic association as the Daughters of the American Revolution.

This society was founded in proud memory of the spirit of this Nation in its first fight for freedom. The enduring courage, the wisdom and the love of liberty of our forebears who fought in that fight is a most precious heritage. You who trace your lineage back to that gallant group have a right to be proud. On you, by virtue of your lineage, there rest especial privileges and duties. It is your special privilege to tend the flame of humanity and freedom that was lighted in the American Revolution and so to perform that service that the memory of those heroic virtues shall survive in our people. And there rests on you an especial charge and duty that, at whatever sacrifice, that spiritual light of justice and liberty shall continue to guide this people in their relations to all the world. For it is the moral and spiritual inspirations of a nation more than its material progress which will determine its destiny.

As a Nation we have grown to a giant strength and power which is so new and vast that we can only vaguely comprehend it. There are showered upon us as a people the blessings of general well-being to a degree which no other nation possesses and that national well-being is more fairly shared among every class of our people than of any other nation. Through the wisdom of our forefathers we have inherited a system of life which yields a larger measure of equality of opportunity—a larger richness of opportunity—than humanity has before discovered. And from this system we have found freedom for ability and character to rise from the humblest condition to leadership, which brings a constant refreshment of the moral and spiritual strength to our Nation. We are content with the fundamental democratic principles of government which we have evolved and under which we live. We are not blind to its errors and crudities, but we are confident of our ability to cure them. We have no patience with those doctrines that would destroy the most successful human experiment in all history.

Because of our geographical situation, because of our great resources and of the American genius for organization, we have, in a sense that no other country has it, security from attack and harm by other nations. We are not only more free from attack, but our people are more free from the haunting fear of attack than are any other people in the world. Because of these blessings, because of our inherited ideals of humanity and liberty, because of our strength, because of our disinterestedness, because of our freedom from these tormenting fears, there rests upon the United States a moral and spiritual duty to undertake a part in securing the peace of the world. Nor does that duty imply any limitation upon our independence. Quite to the contrary, it can only be fulfilled to its fullest measure by maintaining the fullest independence.

I do not put this duty to you upon a basis of self-interest, although it is inevitable that the failure of civilization in any part of the world at once brings distress within our own doors. I have no occasion to emphasize this duty by pointing out the horrors and degradation of war. Those who really know war never glorify it. I have seen too much of the tragic sufferings of men, women, and children, of the black shadows that ever run on the heels of war, to wish to recall those scenes. I hope never to see them again. Because of my abhorrence of war let no one mistake my position, however. There is a price which no nation can afford to pay for peace. Yet I know this Nation can help to make war impossible and that it should so help.

It is easy to preach the national duty of helping to preserve peace. It is easier still to engage in invective or vindictive phrase and slogan which stir national selfishness and self-righteousness. And certainly the way of peace lies neither in the rattling of the scabbard nor the abandonment of defense.

These are matters in which you are deeply interested; not in destructive criticism directed to either extreme, of which we have enough, but in development of constructive public opinion—the most powerful expression of our people. Your cordial resolutions in support of Secretary Kellogg in his efforts which brought about the Kellogg-Briand pact are evidence of the desire of your society to promote the peace of

the world. By that pact with 55 other nations we solemnly pledged ourselves not only to renounce war but to seek means for pacific settlement of all international differences. We were sincere when we signed that pact. We engaged our national honor when we ratified it. And in sincerity and honor two obligations flow from that covenant.

First, the conceptions of military strength of nations are reduced by that covenant solely to such strength as is required for defense. And second, we must cultivate methodical procedure by which controversies between nations can be settled by pacific means. Certainly until the peace machinery of the world has been developed and tested over long years we must maintain such forces of defense as will at every moment prevent the penetration of a hostile force over our borders. And our security to-day is well assured by an Army and Navy whose high tradition of valor and skill is represented in both the command and ranks of to-day and we shall maintain it. Adequate defense requires forces relative to other nations but at the same time with no excesses which will create the fear of aggression from us. Such fear will breed animosities, ill will, and a resolution in others to combine to protect themselves, which are the very seeds of war.

All the world needs relief from the burdens of armies and navies, but disarmament can not be made to contribute to peace unless it is conducted by agreement among nations, for by that method alone can we allay fear and preserve security. One of the deeper causes of friction and ill will in the world has been competition in naval armament. Nothing arouses more fear or lends itself more to the creation of distrust among nations. A proposal on the part of one nation to build more ships of war results in instant fear of inadequate defense, ill will, and suspicion in other nations.

In consonance with the spirit of the Kellogg pact we recently made a renewed effort at reduction and limitation of naval arms by agreement. For nearly 10 years our country has pursued a steady endeavor to bring about such agreements. The Washington Arms Conference of 1922, while it was but partially successful in this direction, yet by limiting battleships and aircraft carriers it accomplished much and laid foundations for the future. Competition, however, started at once in the other types of war craft, and an effort was made by conference between the representatives of the United States, Great Britain, and Japan at Geneva in 1927 to bring it to a halt.

That conference failed and competition took renewed and even more dangerous aspects. A year ago we again initiated negotiations and the conference in London during the past four months by patient labor is now assured of success. It has been able to reach a further great and far-reaching settlement, reducing the number of battleships, creating a holiday in their further construction, together with limitations and reductions in the construction of cruisers, destroyers, and submarines during the next six years. Under the terms now being finally formulated the conference has been able to bring about an actual reduction in the armament of the three nations of about 25 per cent less than the standards discussed during the conference which failed at Geneva three years ago and a reduction of about 12 per cent below present naval programs as rapidly as the present ships become obsolete. But, most important of all, it has been able finally to turn the tide of constantly increasing naval arms and to end the poison of suspicion and ill will generated by constant rivalry in construction.

We have been able to create a situation where there is neither inferiority nor superiority in the naval strength of the United States. This is consonant with the pact we have solemnly entered by which we have pledged ourselves to use our arms solely for defense. We are stronger in defense as a result of the conference. It is an accomplishment that I believe will appeal to the moral and spiritual sense of the American people. Through this agreement we have strengthened the forces of peace. It is an accomplishment that has great material advantages to all its participants, but I prefer to have it judged on the far higher grounds of its contribution to the moral and spiritual welfare of our people and the world, for in the long run those are the grounds on which we and all the world must depend for progress.

The great road to peace indeed lies in the prevention of war. The construction and maintenance of this road requires just as much interest and devotion as the maintenance of defense. The first principle in prevention of war is to guide our national conduct in justice, consideration, and kindness to other nations so as to give no justified cause for ill will or suspicion. War arises from a state of fear, a sense of injustice, and an ill will which culminates in uncontrollable national passions. There are ever present in the world the causes of friction. The far-flung exchange of citizens and their property throughout the world gives hourly birth to large and small controversies; beyond this our generation has inherited a multitude of conflicting interests from of old. These controversies are of many different types; they require distinctively different methods and agencies of settlement. The practical program of the work of peace is to develop and create appropriate agencies for regular methodical disposal and solution of these controversies so as to assure justice and avoid arousing of national emotions.

All civilized nations have developed great skill and experience in their foreign offices whose will and purpose in this century is to

dispose of a multitude of these daily incidents without friction. We have need steadily to expand their machinery and method.

The world has greatly advanced the method of arbitration by scores of treaties; it has by such instances as the Bolivia-Paraguay dispute advanced the method of independent inquiry into fact in cooperation with the parties, and by such instances as the Tacna-Arica controversy, have advanced the method of conciliation. The difficulties in the instance of the Chinese-Russian dispute show the clear need of some method of mobilization of public opinion against the violation of the Kellogg pact. By international conference on specific questions, such as disarmament, we have advanced the method of cooperation in settlement of old standing dangers.

Through precedent and treaty the world is building every year a larger and larger body of international law and practice. Statesmen over a generation have realized that with this growth of international law and precedent another method can be contributed to the pacific settlement of a vast number of incidental controversies of justiciable character if the world had an international court to which such cases could be referred for adequate hearing and independent decision based upon law and justice.

Such a court—the World Court—has been established at The Hague with the aid of American jurists. It has been accepted by 90 per cent of the civilized people of the earth. It is established and no other court is practicable. It has demonstrated the highest integrity and capacity, and the continuance of these qualities is assured. It has already settled a great number of controversies. It is only one, but an important one, of the six or seven methods of securing pacific settlements, and thus a contribution to the prevention of war. Adherence to that court by the United States has been earnestly recommended by every one of our Presidents and every one of our Secretaries of State living since its inception. No one can challenge the patriotism of these 10 men, nor the ripe wisdom which is theirs from having borne the actual burden of responsibility for our foreign relations. They have found no entanglement or limitation of the independence of the United States by safeguarded membership in it.

And in all the discussion as to participation of the United States in this court there are few persons who do not agree as to the desirability and necessity of such a court as one of the additions to our methods of pacific settlement. The contention on this question rests upon the details of special stipulations under which we should join. It is not my purpose to go into these contentions here. I have no doubt they can be solved and that the United States will become a member of the court.

Mankind has within the past decade given more earnest thought to and made more constructive effort and progress toward the elimination of war than in all previous periods of history. In the broader field of our relation to these many methods to prevent war we have during the past few years participated in an increasing number of international discussions, consultations and conferences, arbitrations, and inquiries—all of which represent progress in organizing the world for peace. We shall continue to do so where any important purpose is to be accomplished. And in our cooperation to maintain peace there is one broad policy which I wish to emphasize.

Our rôle in cooperation is different from that of the nations of Europe. That difference rises not only from our geographical setting but from the nature of the maximum contribution we can render to peace. The nations of Europe, surrounded as they are by dangers and problems of which we in the Western Hemisphere have but little appreciation, and beset by inherited fears, hold to the view that aside from the World Court the pacific settlement of controversies and the maintenance of peace should be backed by potential coercion through pooling of either military or economic strength. We do not question their right to come to such conclusions as they see fit to follow, arising as they do from their terrible experience and their necessities. But the instinct of the vast majority of our people is that our contribution is not to be based upon commitments to use force to maintain peace. This arises both from a feeling that the threat of force conflicts with the purpose of peaceful efforts and from the limitation it might place upon our independent action where we have only indirect interest.

We have come to the belief that our contribution can best be made by our good offices and a helpfulness based upon independence from any combination pledged to the use of force. I believe it is clear that the United States can more effectively and wisely work for peace without commitments to use coercion to enforce settlements. Our position was made clear in a statement issued jointly by the Prime Minister of England and myself at the time of his memorable visit of good will to this country, in which we said:

"The part of each of our Governments in the promotion of world peace will be different, as one will never consent to become entangled in European diplomacy and the other is resolved to pursue a policy of active cooperation with its European neighbors, but each of our Governments will direct its thoughts and influence toward securing and maintaining the peace of the world."



Within these principles which are in full accord with the traditions we have from our forefathers, we should hold an open mind and engage in advancement of the methods by which the controversies in the world may find pacific settlement and by which we can cooperate in the prevention of war. For the American people want peace in the world, not alone as a matter of material interest to our prosperity and welfare but because gains to the moral and spiritual forces of the world are made through peace and not through war.

#### THE LIFE-SAVERS' RETIREMENT BILL

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the life-savers' retirement pay bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, the President has just signed a measure in which I have been deeply interested for a number of years.

The act of 1915 provided, among other things, that men disabled in line of duty in the Coast Guard Service should receive, during the continuance of their disability, three-fourths of the pay received by them at the time when such disability occurred.

The Life Saving Service was absorbed by this law into the Coast Guard, but the retired pay was not made applicable to the Life Saving Service.

Senator John Walter Smith, of Maryland, and Senator Martin, of Virginia, tried very hard to get a life-savers' retirement bill passed, but while the bill passed the Senate a great many times, it could never be gotten through the House. I came into the Congress at the same time Senator Smith retired, since which time I have been endeavoring to get this legislation on the statute books. During the present session the bill has been passed by both the House and Senate, has been signed by the President, and become a law.

This act will benefit about 300 of the old life-savers who performed their unselfish and heroic service under most difficult and trying circumstances along our entire coast line. Many of these deserving men are in the First Maryland District, where along the Atlantic they answered every call of distress.

Since long before the time of Socrates men have been trying to devise a means whereby those without influence could obtain justice.

When legislation such as this is passed, even when those to be benefited by it are without great political influence, it makes us feel we are gradually approaching the attitude of mind which evoked the saying of the Master: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

#### SPANISH WAR PENSIONS

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time yielded to me I can do little more than express my thanks to the Committee on Pensions for giving us the opportunity to vote for a bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to Spanish War veterans. The bill deserves the unanimous support of this House.

It gives me much personal pleasure to support this bill, not only because it affords an opportunity to give further evidence of the gratitude I feel for the veterans of all wars, but also because I have always felt very near to the Spanish War veterans. My greatest regret is that I was not permitted to enlist at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. I made the effort but was refused on account of my age. One of my proudest possessions, however, is an honorary membership in the Spanish War veterans' organization conferred upon me by Hardin Camp of Washington, D. C., in recognition of my many efforts in behalf of Spanish War veterans and legislation affecting their interests.

Time will not permit me to retell the wonderful story of the Spanish War veterans but suffice it to say that they wrote one of the most glorious chapters in American history, and by their fight for human liberty helped make this the outstanding Nation of the world. During my almost 14 years of service here I have found them always patient, considerate, reasonable, and gracious. These volunteers through their splendid service to their country and their manly demeanor since, have more than earned the recognition to be given in this bill, and I again express the hope that not a single vote shall be cast in opposition to it.

For all soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition, who served 90 days or more, from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902, increases are provided as follows:

#### Rates for 90-day service

Present law per month:	
One-half disabled	\$30
Three-fourths disabled	40
Totally disabled	50

#### Proposed law per month:

One-half disabled	35
Three-fourths disabled	50
Totally disabled	60

If disabled to the extent that the regular aid and attendance of another person is needed or required, the rate is \$72 per month.

The bill as amended also gives a pensionable status to all soldiers, sailors, and nurses who served but 70 days within that period, as follows:

#### Rates for 70 days' service

	Per month
One-tenth disabled	\$12
One-fourth disabled	15
One-half disabled	18
Three-fourths disabled	24
Totally disabled	30

If disabled to the extent that the regular aid and attendance of another person is needed or required, the rate is \$50 per month.

In addition, there is a provision, based on age, wherein veterans of 70 days' service will receive the following rates:

	Per month
62 years of age	\$12
68 years of age	18
72 years of age	24
75 years of age	30

This will care for a number of veterans who have not been able to get on the rolls as well as increase the rates of those now on. The elimination of the vicious-habits provision in existing law will take care of many more who are not now on the pension rolls.

The bill as amended provides that the pension or increase of pension shall commence from the date of filing the application. Personally I should prefer to have these increases made automatically, without the necessity of filing a claim, but the committee has taken a different view, and under the rules no amendment is in order.

I am informed that 43,846 veterans now on the rolls will be benefited by the increase from \$30 to \$35 per month; that 34,197 veterans will benefit by the increase from \$40 to \$50 per month; and that 24,912 veterans will benefit by the increase from \$50 to \$60 per month. By eliminating the vicious-habits provision from existing law it is estimated that 5 per cent more of the claims filed each year will be taken care of. As there is an average of about 13,000 original claims each year, it will mean that many more additional veterans are to be taken care of under this provision. I heartily approve that provision, which gives a pensionable status to those who served a period of from 70 to 90 days. The Spanish-American War was one of short duration and many veterans were discharged after having served less than 90 days.

In conclusion let me remind you that this is the only war in American history that was ever fought entirely by volunteers. Every man in the Army and Navy, from the private to those in command, served voluntarily. It is also well to remember that it was 22 years after the close of the Spanish-American War before they asked for pension legislation, even though many of them had been suffering from illness incident to their service in the Tropics. Let us to-day show our appreciation of their services by quickly passing this much needed and meritorious legislation. [Applause.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, April 22, after the reading of the Journal and the disposal of business on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there is already a special order for Tuesday, for Mr. BACHMANN, 45 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I wish to follow the gentleman from West Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the special order of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BACHMANN]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time will be taken by these special orders?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia has 45 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to object to the request of the gentleman from Texas, but I shall object to any further requests until we shall have disposed of the veterans' bill.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the event the veterans' bill, now before the House, is disposed of in time, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 25 minutes on day after to-morrow, Friday of this week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that in the event the veterans' bill is disposed of by that time, he may address the House for 25 minutes on Friday of this week. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN HOBOKEN, N. J.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I call up the bill H. R. 11509, on the Union Calendar, and move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. That is automatic.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider in lieu of the bill H. R. 11509 a similar Senate bill now on the Speaker's table, S. 2757, which passed the Senate on Monday of this week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the bill H. R. 11509, and asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill, S. 2757, be substituted therefor. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I also ask that the time be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Tennessee, the minority member of the committee [Mr. DAVIS], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the time consumed in general debate be divided and controlled equally between himself and the gentleman from Tennessee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2757, with Mr. BACON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2757, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the United States Shipping Board is authorized for and on behalf of the United States, to sell the right, title, and interest of the United States in the real property described in Schedule A appended to a proclamation of the President of the United States, dated December 3, 1918, which was taken over by the United States by a proclamation of the President of the United States dated June 28, 1918, pursuant to the authority vested in him by the act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes," approved March 28, 1918. The property transferred to the Treasury Department by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1929, shall not be sold under the provisions of this act.

There shall also be excluded a piece or parcel of land in said city, contiguous to the east line of the present post-office site as transferred under the second deficiency act, 1929, fronting 25 feet along the north line of Newark Street and extending at that width in a northerly direction 175 feet; also a piece or parcel of land 25 feet wide on the northerly side of said post-office site and contiguous thereto, as extended herein, running westerly along the south side of First Street extended, 225 feet, more or less, to the easterly side of River Street.

SEC. 2. Said property shall be sold, in whole or in part, at public competitive sale, for use and operation as piers or terminals, on such terms and conditions as said United States Shipping Board may prescribe, giving due consideration to the interests of the United States and to the development and maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine, in the case of equal bids, but in no case for less than 25 per cent of the purchase price in cash, and payment of the balance of the purchase price, with interest at 5 per cent per annum, shall not be deferred more than five years from date of sale. The right is expressly granted said United States Shipping Board to reject any or all bids for any reason it may deem sufficient.

SEC. 3. The United States Shipping Board shall publish the terms of such sale, and the date and time, and the final date of filing bids, if by the acceptance of bids, at least once in each week during the four weeks preceding such sale, in the Jersey Observer, a daily news-

paper printed and published in the city of Hoboken, N. J., in the Jersey Journal, a daily newspaper printed and published in the city of Jersey City, N. J., and in the Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper printed and published in the city of New York, N. Y., and may publish such notice in such other newspapers or publications, or advertise said sale in such other manner as the United States Shipping Board deems most advisable as affording adequate notice of such sale.

SEC. 4. All sums received as a result of the sale of such property shall be deposited in the construction loan fund created by section 11 of the merchant marine act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 46, sec. 870).

SEC. 5. The United States Shipping Board, in making said sale and the terms and conditions thereof, shall keep in view the policy and primary purposes declared in section 1, merchant marine act, 1920, and confirmed in section 1, merchant marine act, 1928.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for one hour.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, the bill (S. 2757) is a bill to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property belonging to the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J., consisting of a tract of land lying along the water front on the Hudson River, with a number of buildings and five piers thereon.

This property, before our entry into the World War, belonged to two corporations organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey and was used by the Hamburg-American Line and the North German Lloyd, two German steamship companies, as their American termini for their trans-Atlantic commerce, freight and passenger.

When the United States entered the war, by proclamation of the President the United States took possession of the piers, and the piers were used during the war as a point of embarkation and debarkation for our troops. At the conclusion of hostilities this property was turned over to the United States Shipping Board for its administration, and has since then been used by the Shipping Board.

The United States paid, through the Alien Property Custodian, \$7,146,583 for this property. By reason of the manner of its acquisition it is necessary to pass legislation to authorize the Shipping Board to dispose of it. Other property acquired by the Shipping Board for war purposes and by other departments of the Government for war purposes, such as the War Department, may at present, without additional legislation, be disposed of, but this bill is necessary in order to enable the Shipping Board to offer this property for sale.

The property in question extends about 1,800 feet along the Hudson River. It originally contained six piers. A few years ago one pier was wholly destroyed and another pier was partially destroyed by fire, so that there are now four piers in serviceable condition, one totally destroyed, and simply the platform of another, the superstructure having been burned off.

Furthermore, a tract of 25,000 square feet has been taken from this property and used for a post-office site. I think it is fair to assume that at present the property is worth what the Government paid for it, namely, \$7,146,000.

The property is at present partially used by the Shipping Board as a terminus for the United States Lines, the America-France Line, and the American Diamond Line, and some ships of the Munson Line avail themselves of the facilities of these piers, but these services only occupy a part of the piers, and there are at the present time about 500 men employed on and about the piers. Before the war, when the piers were in full use, there were employed approximately 3,000 men. The city of Hoboken is a city about a mile square. This shore front occupies about one-third of the entire shore front. The inability of the Shipping Board to dispose of this property has resulted in the last 11 years in a loss to the city of Hoboken of approximately \$4,000,000 in taxes alone. Also, it has occasioned a loss to the community by withdrawing the purchasing power of 2,500 employed men in a small community of about 60,000 inhabitants. This is reflected in the business of the merchants and in the lack of occupancy of rental dwelling property, and has resulted, for a number of years, in serious economic depression in the city of Hoboken, and this community is entitled to relief therefrom.

With the possession of this valuable property by an owner who is willing to recondition and improve it and put it to its maximum use, as he must necessarily do in order to get a return for the money invested, there will be an increase of upward of \$300,000 in taxes received by the city of Hoboken. There will be an increase in activity and a resultant return of prosperity.

The Shipping Board has sold one of the lines which used one of these piers, the United States Line. The sale of the two other lines now operated by the Shipping Board and which use the piers is pending, that of the America-France and the American Diamond Line. The Munson Line is a privately owned line.



This bill is so drawn that the Shipping Board, in advertising this property for sale, may make and is directed to make terms and conditions which will fully protect the interests of the United States and the maintenance and development of the American merchant marine.

Under such language the Shipping Board may make terms and conditions insuring the use of these piers to these American Lines as long as it may be desirable to so occupy them. Every interest that our ships and that our merchant marine may have in the use of these piers may be safeguarded under the provisions of this bill. The bill only treats this property in the same way that other property of the United States acquired for war purposes is being treated and affords much needed relief to a town in New Jersey, the town of Hoboken, which has suffered more than possibly any other community in the United States as a result of its contribution to the country during the war. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further time desired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Said property shall be sold, in whole or in part, at public competitive sale, for use and operation as piers or terminals, on such terms and conditions as said United States Shipping Board may prescribe, giving due consideration to the interests of the United States and to the development and maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine, in the case of equal bids, but in no case for less than 25 per cent of the purchase price in cash, and payment of the balance of the purchase price, with interest at 5 per cent per annum, shall not be deferred more than five years from date of sale. The right is expressly granted said United States Shipping Board to reject any or all bids for any reason it may deem sufficient.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. In line 25, page 2, of the Senate bill, after the word "marine," strike out the words "in the case of equal bids."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: In line 25, page 2, of the Senate bill, after the word "marine," strike out the words "in the case of equal bids."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment. On page 3, in line 6 of the Senate bill, after the word "sufficient," insert the following:

Said property shall be sold only to a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2, shipping act, 1916, as amended by section 38, merchant marine act, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 3, in line 6 of the Senate bill, after the word "sufficient," insert the following:

"Said property shall be sold only to a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2, shipping act, 1916, as amended by section 38, merchant marine act, 1920."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, if the bill now pending before the committee is enacted into law, it will be the first time in the history of the United States that a publicly owned harbor has been put under the hammer and sold into private ownership. The part of the harbor of Hoboken which is included in this bill is owned and controlled by the Government of the United States. The policy of public ownership of the harbors of this country is well established. All harbors within the United States, both on the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards, and including the Gulf, are either owned outright or controlled by the communities behind them.

Commencing with the port of Seattle in the Pacific Northwest, we find that port is owned and controlled by the city. The port of Everett is publicly owned. The port of Bellingham is publicly owned. The port of Grays Harbor is publicly owned. The port of Olympia is publicly owned. The port of Tacoma is publicly owned. The port of Vancouver is publicly owned. If not owned entirely, they are controlled by the municipalities.

In the State of Oregon there are two river ports, Astoria and Portland, which are both publicly controlled.

In the State of California the port of San Francisco is owned and controlled by the State of California. The port of Oakland, immediately across the bay from the port of San Francisco, is owned and controlled by the city of Oakland. The port of Berkeley, on the Bay of San Francisco, is publicly owned and controlled. The port of Richmond is under public ownership. The port of Los Angeles is owned and controlled by the city of Los Angeles. The port of San Diego is owned and controlled by the city of San Diego.

We pass on to the State of Texas. At the present time the port of Galveston is controlled by the Galveston Wharf Co., which owns about 90 per cent of the development of that harbor. The city of Galveston, however, owns one-third of the interest in the company and is, I have been informed, about to purchase the controlling interest in their own harbor. The port of Freeport, Tex., is publicly controlled. Port Arthur is privately controlled. The port of Texas City is publicly controlled. The port of Houston is publicly owned and controlled, and so is the port of Orange.

In the State of Louisiana the port of New Orleans is owned and controlled by the State of Louisiana.

In the State of Mississippi the port of Gulfport and other minor ports are controlled under the laws of that State. They are publicly owned as public utilities.

In the State of Alabama the port of Mobile is publicly controlled.

In the State of Florida the ports of Tampa, Pensacola, Key West, and Jacksonville are under public control.

In the State of South Carolina the port of Charleston is under public control.

In the State of Virginia the port of Norfolk is partly under private ownership and partly under public ownership, the city of Norfolk and the United States Government having an interest in the harbor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of California. In the State of Maryland the great port of Baltimore is under public control.

In the State of New Jersey the port of Camden is under public control.

I might also say that the New York Port Authority, which derives its powers from the States of New York and New Jersey, has jurisdiction over New York Harbor and the New Jersey side of the Hudson River, and is vested with authority to acquire all parts of the water front under their jurisdiction and place them under public ownership and control.

In the State of Delaware the port of Wilmington is under public control.

In the State of Pennsylvania the ports of Philadelphia and Chester are both under public control.

In the State of Connecticut the port of New Haven, the port of Norwalk, the port of Bridgeport, and the port of New London are under public control.

In the State of Rhode Island the port of Providence is controlled jointly by the State and the city.

In the State of Massachusetts the great port of Boston is owned and controlled by the city of Boston. The ports of Fall River, New Bedford, Lynn, Salem, Beverly, Gloucester, and Newburyport are all under State control.

In the State of New Hampshire the port of Portsmouth is under State supervision and control.

Lastly, the ports in the State of Maine are under the State Harbor Commission of Maine.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of California. I yield.

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. What are the advantages of public control over private ownership?

Mr. WELCH of California. States and communities that control their harbors have considered them as heritages of the people. They are better managed and better opportunities are given to shipping interests under public ownership.

I might add that there are communities that have very little in common with the policy of public ownership of all public utilities, but they make an exception of their ports.

The ports of the United States belong to the people of the United States. They are the gateways through which the com-

merce of this country goes out over the seven seas, and it is considered by the people of all those communities, without exception, that own and control their ports, that the ports can be managed to the greater advantage of the people of the United States through public ownership.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of California. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How is the gentleman going to have this port developed by the public when the administration is not in favor of it, when the Shipping Board is not in favor of it, and these piers and docks are going to waste and destruction and the city of Hoboken does not want them? I could see some force in the gentleman's argument if we could get the administration to back up the policy of public ownership of these ports, but the whole idea seems to be for the Government to get out of business, to get out of the shipping business, to get out of the port business, and, as I understand, Hoboken does not want it and the property is going to waste. What are we going to do with it?

Mr. WELCH of California. I know of no State government or municipality that is getting out of the business of harbor ownership.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They say that Hoboken does not want it and can not afford to buy it.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of California. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. May I state that along the westerly side of the Hudson River, from Constable Hook, Bayonne, northerly for 14 miles, there is only one pier owned by a municipality. The loss of taxes to the city of Hoboken on these piers has nearly made the city bankrupt. The city would gladly buy these piers if it had the money, but it has reached its debt limit and can not purchase the piers and therefore failure to pass this bill means a continuation of the status quo and for possibly the next 10 years there will be practically no activity at these piers whatever.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman refers to the Jersey side?

Mr. PERKINS. I said on the westerly side of the Hudson River.

Mr. WELCH of California. No one representing Hoboken or its harbor has approached the United States Government through the proper channels to see whether it is possible to acquire ownership of the port of Hoboken on terms that could be met by the city without a further bond issue.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is dealing with this question as though these six piers constituted the entire harbor of New York or the entire port of Hoboken. The total frontage here is only 1,800 feet while Hoboken has, in addition, at least 3,600 feet of piers privately owned, and I am informed that the authorities of Hoboken have done everything it has been possible for them to do.

Mr. WELCH of California. No; it was admitted they have not approached the Government for terms and conditions whereby they could finance or amortize the cost of the piers.

Mr. PERKINS. They have no money with which to buy them.

Mr. WELCH of California. They would not need money. That is not necessary. Others have purchased from the Shipping Board lines of steamers without any large capital investment and have paid for the ships out of the earnings of the ships.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will kindly yield for one further question, the gentleman does not suggest that the city of Hoboken should go into the shipping business?

Mr. WELCH of California. No; not the shipping business, but they should go into the harbor business; and if they approach the Government, which they have not done, I believe they could get such terms and conditions from the Government that would enable them to take over the greatest asset they could possibly have.

Let me give you some figures as to the returns on this antiquated and dilapidated harbor as it has been referred to here:

The fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, shows a net profit of over \$400,000; the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, shows a net profit of approximately \$400,000; the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, shows an actual profit of \$304,047.01; the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, shows an actual profit of \$290,030.41. In other words, the United States Government is selling an asset and not a liability.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WELCH of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The taxes realized by the city of Hoboken on this property amounted to about \$300,000 per annum. Do the figures that the gentleman has given deduct anything for taxes?

Mr. WELCH of California. No.

Mr. PERKINS. Of course, you can make a profit, if you do not have to pay taxes.

Mr. WELCH of California. You can not collect taxes on Government property, and my point is that if they will even attempt negotiations with the Government, which they have not done—

Mr. PERKINS. The Government, by avoiding the payment of taxes, can make a profit on almost anything. The city of Hoboken is much better off if it gets \$300,000 from this property in the way of taxes than if it were to undertake to own and manage the property.

Mr. WELCH of California. There is not a harbor in the United States from Maine along the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf of Mexico and along the western coast from San Diego to Seattle that is not a financial asset, yielding handsome revenues to the communities that own and control them.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice in section 2 of the bill this language:

Said property shall be sold in whole or in part at public or private competitive sale.

Now, what is a "private competitive sale"?

Mr. LEHLBACH. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman has the wrong bill. The gentleman has the bill as reported from the committee, but the Senate struck out on the floor of the Senate the words "or private," and that is not in the bill at present.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The House bill as reported to the House contains these words. They do not appear to have been stricken out of this bill. The language is that the property may be sold, in whole or in part, "at public or private competitive sale."

And in the next paragraph is a provision that the United States Shipping Board shall publish the terms of such sale and the date and time, and the final date of filing bids—

If by the acceptance of bids—

And so forth. That "if" and the language of section 2, taken together, mean that the board is to have absolute discretion to sell this Government property at private sale.

Mr. LEHLBACH. If the gentleman will yield I will request more time for the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Now will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. WELCH of California. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman from Wisconsin is looking at a copy of S. 2757, as it was reported from the Committee on Commerce in the Senate. The bill, as it passed the Senate and printed and being considered here at the present time, does not contain the words "or private." So the bill reads:

Said property shall be sold in whole or in part at public competitive sale.

Furthermore, the words the gentleman takes exception to—

The United States Shipping Board shall publish the terms of such sale and the date and time and the final date of filing bids—

Meaning that if it is to be sold by public auction, then there is no filing of bids.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I understand that, of course. But section 2 provides for "private competitive sale," and section 3 that the board shall publish the terms of such sale and the date and time and the final date of filing bids "if by the acceptance of bids"—which shows, as I have said, that it was contemplated in the original House bill as reported by the committee that this property should be sold, in the discretion of the Shipping Board, at private sale. I sent for a copy of the bill which is now before us, and the copy I have in my hand was brought from the desk and handed to me.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first sentence of the section now under consideration be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. Said property shall be sold, in whole or in part, at public competitive sale, for use and operation as piers or terminals—

And so forth.



Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield? I want to say a word in reply to the gentleman from New Jersey. The report of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], reporting H. R. 11509, the House bill, contains this language:

The following is the text of the bill, with the amendments in italics: " \* \* \* Said property shall be sold, in whole or in part, at public or private competitive sale."

That was in the report submitted by the gentleman from New Jersey himself on the House bill and shows that he must be in favor of the enactment of the provision for private sale.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman from New Jersey says that he reported the bill in the same language as the bill reported in the Senate in order that the substitution might be made, and then the House would have ample opportunity to amend the bill.

Mr. WELCH of California. Now further discussing the question of the tax return from the Hoboken Harbor, Dr. Harvey M. Davis, president of the Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., appeared before the committee, and he was asked by me:

Do you know of any State or any municipality in the United States that owns and controls its harbor that would turn over its harbor to private ownership in order to get a tax return on them?

Doctor Davis's answer to that question was:

I am not familiar with the details about ownership. I might say personally that I am heartily in sympathy with your views on that subject, but at the present time none of us in Hoboken have been able to see our way clear to work out such a situation there.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, they have made no attempt to acquire ownership from the United States Government. They have not approached the Government, and there is not anyone here who speaks for this bill who can say to the contrary. We have a right to assume that if the city of Hoboken approached the United States Government in the same manner that the prospective owners and men who have acquired control of our steamship lines have done, that the harbor of Hoboken, which is a heritage of the people and their greatest asset, would be given to them on the same financial terms that others have secured control of our shipping lines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The major premise upon which the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] bases his argument is perfectly sound. Where there is a harbor located wholly within a community it is sound public policy for that community to control the harbor and the port facilities which surround the water. That is the case in every instance in the ports of which he has spoken; where the port is wholly controlled and owned by the municipality in which it lies; but it so happens that this is not the case with respect to the port in which this property in Hoboken is located. The port of New York is not located in any one municipality or in any one county or in any one State. The port of New York is bounded in part by the State of New Jersey and the State of New York.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is it the intention of the city of Hoboken to bid for these piers?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It is not.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Nor the State?

Mr. LEHLBACH. No.

Mrs. NORTON. But there is nothing in the bill to prevent the city of Hoboken from bidding for them?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Oh, no. If the city wants to acquire this property, it is at liberty to do so under the terms and provisions of this bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And also the State of New Jersey?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Surely, as far as the bill is concerned. The State of New Jersey can buy it, as far as the bill is concerned. The port of New York is bounded by four counties in New Jersey and by as many boroughs in the greater city of New York, and as many counties. There is no harbor of Hoboken nor is there a port of Hoboken. All that Hoboken has to do with the port of New York is that it is located several miles up the Hudson River from New York Bay on the right bank, the west bank of the river extending along the river about 1 mile.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. WELCH of California. Is it not quite to the contrary—that the port of Hoboken is a harbor terminal, where the water is 40 to 60 feet deep, and is the gateway to Europe?

Mr. LEHLBACH. It is a little bit of land embraced in the port of New York. It is not an entity; there is no such thing as the port of Hoboken or the harbor of Hoboken. It is just a little stretch along the New Jersey bank of the Hudson River, and it could not make a dent on any harbor or port policy if it owned the docks or did not own them. There is not a single piece of water front developed for pier or dock purposes in the State of New Jersey or in the State of New York abutting on the port of New York that is publicly owned except the property in the city of New York, which happens to be owned by the city and is managed and run by the city through its dock commissioners exactly as private enterprises run the property used for the same purpose over in New Jersey or up the Hudson River on the New York side beyond the limits of the city of Greater New York, and the city of New York, by reason of the fact that it owns these dock properties and leases them out, has nothing to say about the control of the harbor, which is a national matter, any more than Hoboken has, which does not own the property, or that the State of New Jersey or the State of New York has that does not own the property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In order to ask whether there is any provision in this bill giving the Government the right to resume this property, which has been so valuable in time of war, in case we should again engage in war?

Mr. LEHLBACH. The Shipping Board is vested with that authority.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Is that perfectly clear; that in time of war that property could be resumed by the United States Government for the purpose for which it was used?

Mr. LEHLBACH. The Shipping Board has ample opportunity to do that under this language.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I assumed that there was such a provision.

Mr. LEHLBACH. It is in general language to cover all contingencies, and under that language the contingency to which the gentleman has directed specific attention is covered.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I think that is the usual provision which has gone into nearly all the legislation authorizing the parting with the facilities and properties that we have had in time of war, when necessary for war purposes.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I read from the bill:

Said property shall be sold, in whole or in part, at public competitive sale, for use and operation as piers or terminals, on such terms and conditions as said United States Shipping Board may prescribe, giving due consideration to the interests of the United States and to the development and maintenance of an adequate American merchant marine.

That language allows such recapture clause to be made a condition in the proposal under which the property is offered for sale, and it goes beyond that and allows a reservation for use by the American merchant marine of these piers.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That means discretion in the United States Shipping Board, but the question is whether we ought not specifically to make a condition of sale of that kind.

Mr. LEHLBACH. There is no such provision with respect to the sale of any property of this kind in any merchant marine act under which the property was acquired, held, and disposed of.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. In order to effectually dispose of the question of whether this is a harbor or port, is it not true that there are over 75 miles of water front within the harbor of the city of New York, and that this is just 1,800 feet of that amount?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; that is true.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will ask the gentleman if it would not be possible for the Government to commandeer any property in the case of need in time of war?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Certainly.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes. But there is no authority to-day, as I understand it, for doing that.

Mr. PERKINS. Within the entire compass of the influence of the city of New York all the populations of every municipality have increased except the city of Hoboken, which has decreased, largely by the fact that this property is held out by the Government. Is not that a fact?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; and furthermore, as my colleague points out, this provision covers 1,800 feet out of a total of 75 miles. The States of New Jersey and of New York provide by a joint treaty for a board or commission appointed respectively by the Governors of New Jersey and New York and known as the port authority. This deals with the port as an entity, and whether Hoboken owns 1,800 feet or not does not affect the policy of the port of New York.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Have the authorities refused to improve this property?

Mr. LEHLBACH. This property consists of six piers. About one-third of the property has been destroyed by fire, and not a plank has been laid or a nail driven to restore it for use by the Shipping Board. To indicate what can be done to serve the public as compared with what they are doing now I may say that there are now employed only about 500 men in and around these piers, while before the war there were employed continuously upwards of 3,000 men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. May I have two minutes more? I will take two minutes more. Furthermore, by reason of the depression in the city of Hoboken, caused by the withdrawal of this property from effective use, there is not a community within the metropolitan area, in a radius of 50 miles from Manhattan Island, that has not increased in population and wealth to a greater degree.

Mr. PERKINS. The population in 1910 was only 70,000 and in 1920 it was only 66,166.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The city of Hoboken is now up to its debt limit. It can not borrow another dollar under the law of the State. It has no credit. It has no money in its treasury. It is not in position to buy this property, and if you should propose to turn it over free of charge it has not the money sufficient to develop it in order to put it to a remunerative use. It is idle to talk about the city of Hoboken acquiring this property. It can not do it.

Mr. PERKINS. Has not the city of Hoboken lost a great deal in taxes?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes. Since the war they have lost in taxes that they would otherwise have collected, \$4,000,000. The property cost only \$7,146,000.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the statement made by the two gentlemen from New Jersey that this is simply 1,800 feet of inconsequential and unimportant property, I say it is a very valuable piece of water front, as valuable a piece of water-front property as exists in the whole world. Eighteen hundred feet of water front along the Hudson in the port of New York is worth millions of dollars.

This bill is a distinct step backward, in keeping with some of the other brilliant ideas which have come from the Shipping Board. I concede the predicament of the municipality of Hoboken. There is no question about it. There may be no question but that they are not now financially able to buy this property and pay cash for it. But, gentlemen, I submit that the city of Hoboken ought to be given some consideration, in view of the fact stated by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PERKINS] that it has lost \$4,000,000 of taxes during the last 12 years. Give the same consideration to the city of Hoboken as has been given to itinerant and irresponsible individuals who have acquired favors from the Shipping Board, and millions of dollars of property for ridiculously low prices, and in many instances with little or no cash payment. Instead of permitting this property to be sold to an individual operator by the payment of 25 per cent cash and the rest when the Government can get it, let us permit the city of Hoboken to operate these piers and pay a part of the rental which she can receive from the Government for a period, say of 20 years, if that is necessary.

Why not make it possible for Hoboken to acquire this property on the same basis as ships have been given to private corporations?

Has anybody thought of that? I submit this proposition to the distinguished gentleman from Hoboken: The Government could convey these piers to the city of Hoboken. The city could pay the Government a fair percentage of the rentals obtained. At the end the city would own the piers and receive greater revenue than taxes. The Government would be taking no risks, for the property itself would be the security for payment. Terms even more generous than this were made to private corporations. Do you not know that individuals have purchased ships from the Shipping Board for \$6 a ton, when it costs the Shipping Board \$20 a ton to recondition those ships, and that

they are paying for them in small annual installments? This House would in a minute pass a bill to transfer these piers to the city of Hoboken. Let them pay a percentage on the rentals to the Government and thereby retain the piers in public ownership.

The gentleman asks, Can we recapture these piers? Remember that we paid during the war over \$7,000,000 for these piers. It is one of the first pieces of property taken by the Government. These piers are so well located—in the port of New York, right near railroad terminals. A priceless piece of dock property, which must not be turned over to private control for exploitation at the expense of American shipping.

Mr. AUF DER HEIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. AUF DER HEIDE. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that it is impossible for the city of Hoboken to raise any money when they are up to their bonded-indebtedness limit now. They have tried for five years back to get legislation from the city to purchase the piers. How are you to remedy it?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Let Hoboken take them over on the terms I have suggested, so long as we can keep these piers in public ownership instead of disposing of them in the imprudent, reckless manner provided in this bill.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] points out that there are only 500 men employed now, whereas before there were 3,000 men, but the same 3,000 men are employed on other piers where the ships of the North German Lloyd and the Hamburg-American Line now dock. Business has been driven away—yes; purposely and maliciously driven away—from these piers by the Shipping Board in order to sell them for a song to some of O'Connor's favorites. My objection to this bill is not antagonistic to the city of Hoboken. It is entirely in sympathy with the city of Hoboken and for the best interest of our Government and American shipping.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Does the gentleman not feel that the city of Hoboken itself ought to be the best judge of what it desires?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a fact that the city of Hoboken approves this bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not think it is.

Mrs. NORTON. I think the gentleman will find that it does.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not think it was ever put up to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It was never put up to the city of Hoboken to receive the same advantageous terms that were given to private corporations by the Shipping Board.

Mr. KADING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. KADING. For the information of the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I would like to inform the gentleman that the representatives of the city of Hoboken in large number were present, and they made known the fact that they were not interested in receiving this property or in attempting to buy it, and did not want it if it was given to them, and they were not able to handle it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I repeat, a fair, advantageous offer was never made to the city. But if the city of Hoboken is not interested in its own welfare, if the city of Hoboken wants to go on record and say that they would not take these piers in part payment for what they receive from this sale, that is their lookout. But there is a greater interest, and that is the interest of the American people and the American merchant marine in the priceless water front of Hoboken.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I may say there has been no question of more importance before the people of Hoboken in the last 10 years than these piers.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Because they have looked at it from one side only, and that is the loss of taxes, and I can understand that attitude, but let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KADING] and the other members of the committee that we have given hundreds of millions of dollars of Shipping Board property away to private individuals, who have paid for it in small monthly installments, and I submit the people of



Hoboken are entitled to the same consideration, especially when it involves a part of the water front of the greatest port in the world.

Mr. WELCH of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. WELCH of California. I also am a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I attended the hearings, and I have a copy of the hearings with me. Much as I dislike to dispute the word of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KADING], I must, in fairness, say that the statement referred to by the gentleman was not made, nor can it be found in the hearings, that the people of Hoboken would not take the piers if given to them for nothing. On the contrary, they expressed a willingness and desire to acquire these piers if they could secure them on the same terms as referred to by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I do not know whether it appears in the record or whether it was taken down by the stenographer, but the city of Hoboken is governed by a commission. The commissioner who spoke in behalf of the government of the municipality in my hearing said that the city would not want to take this property as a gift, because it had no money to recondition and develop it and prepare it for useful occupancy.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then, I will say that I have a report from the Comptroller General, concerning some ships that were reconditioned. We took ships that were out of condition, just as these piers described by the gentleman from New Jersey, and we spent from \$20 to \$26 a ton to recondition those ships, and we sold them for \$6 a ton to private parties, with a very small part payment down.

I say, that in order to conserve this property, as pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], property so important that one of the first acts of the Government after the declaration of war was to take these piers at a cost of \$7,000,000, we could give the same terms and conditions to the city of Hoboken, having reconditioned these piers, and if the city of Hoboken then refuses to be helped, then we should hold them ourselves.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I agree with what the gentleman says, that these piers should be in public ownership for the benefit of the public, but we have this situation: The Shipping Board will not repair them, and the city of Hoboken does not want them. They are going to destruction. Is the gentleman going to get out a mandamus and make the city of Hoboken take them?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No, indeed. I only insist that the city of Hoboken be given the same terms given to private corporations.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is the gentleman going to get out a mandamus and make President Hoover make the Shipping Board fix them up?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; if the Shipping Board does not do its duty, Congress should be able to find a way to make them do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What are we going to do with them?

Mr. WELCH of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. WELCH of California. The representative of the city of Hoboken said they could not take them unless they could finance them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This deadlock is brought about by the failure to have the city of Hoboken know what is possible under the present generous policy of the Government and the Shipping Board in respect to disposition of Shipping Board property and to build up a merchant marine. It is just as much a part of the merchant marine to have proper dock facilities as it is to have ships. That being so, the law permitting the giving to private operators of ships at low cost, helping them on easy payments, loaning money for the construction of new ships we could have done the same thing with the city of Hoboken, and let the city of Hoboken recapture what it has lost in back taxes, and keep these important piers in public ownership.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Do I understand the gentleman to mean to turn the piers over to Hoboken and let them operate them and take out the taxes, receive rentals, and then turn the balance over to the National Government, on account of the piers?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Any easy-payment plan. Anything to retain these piers in public ownership.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The trouble is nobody wants them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. They will.

Mr. AUF DER HEIDE. How will the city of Hoboken finance the rebuilding or repairing of these piers?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let the Shipping Board do it, just as they have been spending millions repairing and reconditioning the ships. Let us not turn this property over to private control. The tendency all over this country is to keep water front and dock property under public control. The best interest of American shipping demands such a policy. This bill is a step backward.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. AUF DER HEIDE. For 10 or 12 years the city has been trying to get some relief. And we believe that the bill under consideration provides the only relief we can see in the near future. The officials of the city of Hoboken are in favor of the Kean-Auf der Heide bill, and I quote the following telegram received from the mayor of the city of Hoboken:

Congressman O. L. AUF DER HEIDE,

House of Representatives:

I wish to inform you that I am in favor of the Kean-Auf der Heide bill for the sale of the Hoboken piers to the highest bidder. No one is authorized by me to request you to amend your bill to sell the piers to the city of Hoboken. The Board of Commissioners of Hoboken are interested in having the piers placed back in the tax ratables of the city.

BERNARD N. MCFEELEY,  
Mayor City of Hoboken.

At the commencement of the war the United States took over the possession of these piers and subsequently, on June 28, 1918, acquired title to the said property for the sum of \$7,146,583, which money was paid over to the Alien Property Custodian and subsequently paid over to the stockholders of the corporations owning the piers.

When these piers were owned by private corporations the city of Hoboken was able to include them in the taxable ratables and received tax payments on them.

Since the Government acquired title to the properties Hoboken has been unable, by reason of law, to collect any taxes on the properties.

During the war period and for a short time thereafter the piers were used by the War Department as an embarkation point for the transportation of soldiers overseas. Hundreds of thousands of American soldiers embarked for overseas duty from these piers and upon their return home were landed at the same piers.

The piers were then turned over to the United States Shipping Board for operation, to be used by their ships at the port of New York. When the Shipping Board acquired control of the piers the properties ceased to be used exclusively and entirely for governmental purposes. The Shipping Board put them to commercial uses.

When the merchant marine act of 1920 was passed it provided in the last paragraph of section 17 that "None of such property shall be sold except as may be hereafter provided by law."

During the time of the operation of these piers by the Shipping Board for commercial purposes, and while Hoboken was being deprived of millions of dollars in taxes, the Shipping Board was annually showing a profit of hundreds of thousands of dollars in the operation of these piers. According to the reports of the Shipping Board, the United States Government, through the instrumentality of the board, was profiting handsomely at the expense of Hoboken.

While the profits have been accruing to the benefit of the United States Government, the city of Hoboken has been compelled to suffer the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars each year in taxes.

In 1921 one of the piers (Pier No. 5) was destroyed by fire and has not been rebuilt.

In view of the new policy of the Shipping Board to dispose of its ships and properties to private American companies, there is no reason why the Hoboken terminal should be held any longer.

The loss of taxes to the city of Hoboken has placed on the shoulders of the people of that little city an unfair and unjust burden. For the past 10 or 11 years, or ever since the United States acquired title to the property, various efforts have been made by people interested in Hoboken to obtain relief. Various bills and resolutions have been introduced in both Houses of Congress to give relief to Hoboken, but without any success; the main objection arising from the Shipping Board, who stated that, although they sympathized with the unfortunate plight in which Hoboken was placed, they desired docking facilities in the port of New York, and the Hoboken terminal provided for that need. However, the piers are no longer used by ships operated by the Shipping Board, but are now leased to American companies for facilities for American ships.

The only practical way by which the city of Hoboken can get relief is for Congress to give the Shipping Board authorization to sell the piers; and, after this authorization has been granted, for the Shipping Board to advertise the properties for sale at the earliest possible time. It is only when these pier properties are sold to private corporations that Hoboken will be able to receive taxes which are so justly due the city.

The justice of Hoboken's cause is so evident that I respectfully urge you to vote for the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. This is the first time in my experience, and as far as I know in the history of the Federal Government, that it has been seriously proposed in Congress that the Federal Government impose upon an unwilling governmental body a policy which it does not want to follow.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words. When I tell you I have been very ill for the past three weeks and practically got out of bed this morning for the purpose of coming here because of my intense interest in this bill I think you will understand just how important it is to the city of Hoboken. While Hoboken is not in my district, it is a neighboring city, and I happen to know what its problems have been during the past 10 years since the revenue from these piers has been taken away from the city.

I want to say to you that Hoboken is only a mile-square city. Its revenues are very few in comparison with its population, and ever since these piers were taken from Hoboken it has been an impossibility for Hoboken to pay its just debts. Therefore when this bill was introduced all of the questions that have been brought up here to-day were considered. There is nothing I can add, even if I were able, to that which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] has already told you, except to say this, that I think everybody will concede that a city should know just what it wants much better than any other city can tell it what it wants. [Applause.]

I know the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has the very best of intentions in presenting his argument, and I know my friend, Mr. LA GUARDIA, feels the same way. They are both trying to help Hoboken, but is it not a fact that Hoboken ought to know what it wants itself much better than the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], or anyone else?

When the mayor of Hoboken, the Chamber of Commerce of Hoboken, representatives of all of the big organizations, and many of the leading business people of Hoboken came before the committee and approved this bill then it seems to me to be only common sense to assume that Hoboken should be recognized in asking for what it wants. I sincerely hope you will pass this bill and give this relief to the city of Hoboken, a city which has been so gravely in need of it during the past 10 years.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Is it not true that not only the governing body of Hoboken but every public-spirited person of Hoboken has given consideration to every phase and every possibility of this question, and have come to the conclusion that the only practical and sensible thing for Hoboken to do is to have these piers sold?

Mrs. NORTON. That is absolutely true. Hoboken needs the revenue, and if the city of Hoboken wants to come in and bid in these piers there is nothing in this bill to prevent the city from doing so.

I sincerely hope the gentlemen of this House, both on our side and on your side, will recognize the merits and justice of this bill and will see that it is passed to-day, so that Hoboken may obtain some relief from the intolerable situation the city has found itself in ever since the Government deprived the people of this source of revenue. I thank you for your consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BACON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2757) to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J., had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEHLBACH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

House bill 11509 was laid on the table.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM FOR THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF FISHERIES

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7405) to provide for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7405, with Mr. SUMMERS of Washington in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7405, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, such amounts as may be necessary for—

(1) The establishment of a fish-cultural station in each of the following States, at a cost not to exceed the amount specified: New Mexico, \$50,000; Idaho, \$60,000.

(2) The establishment of a fish-cultural substation in each of the following States, at a cost not to exceed the amount specified: Wisconsin (in the southern part of the State), \$50,000; Montana, \$35,000; Colorado, \$35,000; New Hampshire (in the White Mountain Forest), \$25,000.

(3) The establishment of a fishery laboratory in the State of Washington, at a cost not to exceed \$125,000.

(4) The establishment of experimental and bass and trout stations in the State of Maryland or West Virginia at a cost not to exceed \$75,000.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, such amounts as may be necessary for—

(1) The establishment of a fish-cultural station in each of the following States, at a cost not to exceed the amount specified: Alabama, \$50,000; Indiana, \$50,000; Tennessee (in the middle division of the State), \$50,000; Pennsylvania (including a substation), \$100,000.

(2) The establishment of a fish-cultural substation in each of the following States, at a cost not to exceed the amount specified: South Carolina, or the enlargement of Orangeburg station in said State, \$25,000; Texas (in the western part of the State), \$35,000; New York, \$35,000.

(3) The purchase of Mill Creek station in the State of California, at a cost not to exceed \$20,000.

(4) The purchase and repair of the Rogue River substation in the State of Oregon, at a cost not to exceed \$35,000.



Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, such amounts as may be necessary for—

(1) The establishment of a fish-cultural station in the State of Florida, at a cost not to exceed \$60,000.

(2) The establishment of a fish-cultural substation in each of the following States, at a cost not to exceed the amount specified: Maine (including enlargement of Craig Brook station), \$50,000; Virginia (in the eastern part of the State), \$75,000.

(3) The establishment of a fishery laboratory in the State of Texas (on the Gulf coast of the eastern part of the State), at a cost not to exceed \$75,000.

(4) The purchase or construction of a steel fish-distribution car, at a cost not to exceed \$75,000.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, such amounts as may be necessary for—

(1) The establishment of a fish-cultural station in each of the following States, at a cost not to exceed the amount specified: Nevada, \$60,000; Illinois, \$75,000; New Jersey, \$75,000.

(2) The purchase or construction of a steel fish-distribution car at a cost not to exceed \$75,000.

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, such amounts as may be necessary for—

(1) The establishment of a fish-cultural substation in each of the following States, at a cost not to exceed the amount specified: Ohio, \$35,000; Kansas, \$35,000; North Dakota, \$35,000; Georgia, \$35,000.

(2) The purchase and repair of the Little White Salmon station in the State of Washington, at a cost not to exceed \$35,000.

(3) The establishment of a fishery laboratory in the Territory of Alaska, at a cost not to exceed \$50,000.

(4) The establishment of an experimental and bass and trout station in the Pisgah National Forest or in the Great Smoky National Park in the State of North Carolina upon the acquisition of said park by the United States, at a cost not to exceed \$35,000.

Sec. 6. (a) The stations, substations, and laboratories authorized by sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 shall be located in the States and parts thereof and in the Territory specified, at such suitable points as may be selected by the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) Any appropriation made under authority of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 may be expended for the purchase of sites, and the purchase of equipment, the construction of buildings and ponds, and for such other expenses as may be incidental to the cost of the establishment, purchase, or enlargement, as the case may be, of the station, substation, or laboratory in question.

(c) No part of an appropriation made under authority of section 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 shall be expended in the construction, purchase, or enlargement of a station or substation until the State in which such station or substation is to be located shall have by legislative action accorded to the United States Commissioner of Fisheries and his duly authorized agents the right to conduct fish hatching and fish culture and all operations connected therewith in any manner and at any time that may by the commissioner be considered necessary and proper, any laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding. The operation of any station, substation, or laboratory established, purchased, or enlarged under authority of this act shall be discontinued whenever the State ceases to accord such right; and such operation may be suspended by the Secretary of Commerce whenever in his judgment State laws or regulations affecting fishes cultivated are allowed to remain so inadequate as to impair the efficiency of such station, substation, or laboratory.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to all other amounts authorized by law to be appropriated, the following amounts during the fiscal years specified:

(1) For the purpose of providing adequate maintenance costs and personnel for the Division of Fish Culture, Bureau of Fisheries: Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$100,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$200,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$300,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$400,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$500,000. Of each amount authorized by this paragraph to be appropriated, 30 per cent is authorized for salaries at the seat of government and elsewhere.

(2) To meet the demand for fundamental knowledge regarding our great commercial fisheries and for developing the natural cultivation of oysters, mussels, and other mollusca, and the improvement of pond culture and other operations of the Division of Inquiry, Bureau of Fisheries, respecting food fishes: Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$75,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$150,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$180,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$240,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$300,000. Of each amount authorized by this paragraph to be appropriated 40 per cent is authorized for salaries at the seat of government and elsewhere, and not to exceed \$10,000 in any year for a survey of the fisheries of the Hawaiian Islands.

(3) To provide for the proper husbandry of our fisheries, improvements in methods of capture, merchandising, and distribution of our

fishery harvest, including saving and utilization of waste products, and other operations of the Division of Fishery Industries, Bureau of Fisheries: Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$35,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$70,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$105,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$140,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$175,000. Of each amount authorized by this paragraph to be appropriated 40 per cent is authorized for salaries at the seat of government and elsewhere.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, this bill—H. R. 7405—introduced by Mr. WHITE, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and unanimously reported by that committee, provides for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries.

For a number of years the question of outlining and developing a policy of increasing the facilities for the raising and distribution of food fish has been considered both by the administrative agencies of the Government and by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. With the cooperation of the Bureau of Fisheries, the aid of its fish experts, and the committee there has been drafted this comprehensive measure which provides for a program of construction extending over a period of five years.

This bill received the approval of the House and the Senate in the last Congress, and is now again presented for the consideration of the House. There is urgent need for such a comprehensive program of fish development. There has been a considerable decrease in all kinds of food fishes which in time will bring about a serious condition to the people. In certain cases the decrease in the catch is actually alarming and has arrested the attention of the administration, and has been forcibly brought home to the committee. As an illustration, I call attention to the fact that the catch of shad has decreased in 30 years from nearly 51,000,000 pounds to less than 15,000,000 pounds. Thirty-five years ago sturgeon were caught to the extent of approximately 18,000,000 pounds. During the last recorded year the catch had shrunk to 1,200,000 pounds. The catch of lobster in the New England States in 1890 was 30,000,000 pounds, but in recent years has shrunk to 10,660,000 pounds.

Thus, it will be seen that the part of wisdom is to give serious consideration to the replenishment of our fish stock and our fish supply, and for this reason this bill is before us for consideration at the present time. The program embraces approximately 31 new stations or substations involving 27 entirely new projects. When it is completed the Bureau of Fisheries will have 106 stations of all kinds. At the present time it has but 75.

The expenditure that is to be spread over the 5-year period is \$1,735,000.

The bill, as I have said, has been prepared jointly by the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It has the unanimous approval of the committee, it has the approval of the Bureau of Fisheries, and it has the approval of the administration, through the Bureau of the Budget, with respect to the expenditures involved.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. I am very much in sympathy with this bill. In the Western States, particularly in my State, a policy of planting fish in lakes, some of which have not heretofore sustained fish life, has been carried out and it has been found that the fish live in some lakes and die in others. It is believed that there is a lack of food in some of the lakes. Will this bill authorize a survey in advance of the planting of these fish, to see whether the food supply is sufficient to maintain the fish planted in the lakes? Is there authority for such a study and survey?

Mr. LEHLBACH. In addition to the money for the construction of the additional fish stations, there is authority for the expenditure of money for experimental purposes such as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. COLTON. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think the bill ought to contain some provision for the inspection of waters in which the fish are placed? I know they often send out fish, and they merely ask you the station to which they are to go and the nature of the lake or river you are going to put them in, and there is no inspection of the lake or river to find out whether there is sufficient food for the fish you place there or whether you are placing there the proper kind of fish.

Mr. LEHLBACH. That is so obviously a matter of administration, the discretion of supplying fish upon application being vested in the Bureau of Fisheries, that it can be assumed that if there is doubt as to whether the waters to be stocked are

susceptible of being successfully stocked, an inspection of the waters will be made; but in a good many instances a physical inspection is unnecessary, because the character and quality of the stream or lake is already known to the bureau.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That may be, but I should think some one would be sent out to look it over to see whether it was proper water in which to place the fish.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I assume, where that is necessary, it is done.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. As I understand, this is the same bill that passed both Houses of Congress two years ago and died through a pocket veto.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Substantially the same bill. So far as the projects are concerned, it is the same bill.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand, this bill provides for extension of fish propagation throughout the entire country, game fish as well as merchantable fish.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes; and I would like to say before yielding the floor that the committee for a number of years has followed the policy of not embracing in a program of this kind any project which did not have the indorsement of the experts of the Bureau of Fisheries, so that every project we here recommend and authorize an appropriation for has such authoritative indorsement by the responsible branch of the administration.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the acting chairman of our committee, in connection with the large decrease of sturgeon, shad, and other fish shown, if there has been a like decrease or has there been a compensating increase in that other very numerous kind of fish evidenced by the great shoal movements in Wall Street and elsewhere during the last year; has there been such an increase of suckers in this country as to balance the loss of sturgeon and shad?

Mr. LEHLBACH. The gentleman is aware of the fact there has been a great increase in that kind of fish, but it could not be called a compensatory increase, because the sucker is a kind of fish that is not useful for edible purposes or anything else.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is a very comprehensive bill, and one in which the whole country is very much interested. I am sure that when the entire membership of the House finds out what our committee has done there will be unanimous approval of the bill, as there was in the committee.

This bill provides for a 5-year program, and takes care of every section of the country for the propagation of fish and for the distribution of fish, not only of the game variety but also of the commercial variety. It also provides to meet the demand for fundamental knowledge regarding our great commercial fisheries and for developing the natural cultivation of oysters, mussels, and other mollusca, and the improvement of pond cultural and other operations of the division of inquiry, Bureau of Fisheries, respecting food fishes. It also provides for the proper husbandry of our fisheries, improvements in the methods of capture, merchandising, and distribution of our fishery harvest.

I am very much interested in the fishing situation because I come from a part of the country greatly engaged in fishing. My district alone has some 2,000 square miles of fishing waters. We have had commercial fisheries and we have seen the fish being depleted year after year because there has been no sufficient cooperation between the Federal and the State Governments.

The State of North Carolina recently established a department of conservation and development. Our legislature recently appropriated some \$500,000 to be used in conjunction with the Government of the United States for the study, and for the maintenance, hatching, and for the distribution of fish, and for the acquisition of knowledge and things that would tend to build up the fishing industry of our section.

We have this 5-year program, which will mean much for our section, as well as the country at large.

It may be of interest to you to know that before our present occupant of the White House, who is a great fisherman, became President, I had a consultation with him in reference to this character of legislation, and he called my attention to the fact that on the eastern coast there was a great falling off of the supply of fish, and that there ought to be a comprehensive development of this important industry.

We bring the legislation before the House, with not only the approval of the President, but the approval of the Budget, the approval of the Fish Commissioner, Mr. O'Malley. It is a great piece of legislation and means much to our whole country. It is one thing that we can all get together on regardless of politics.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. Fishing is something that we can all get together on.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes; there is no controversy among us—fishermen.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman has mentioned those who are supporting the bill, I would like to ask if the Izaak Walton League approves of this? [Laughter.]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Absolutely, the Izaak Walton League is in favor of it. Anybody that believes in fishing is in favor of it.

I want to call attention to one thing in connection with our game and fish, and that is that the hard surface roads and the automobile has brought about a great depletion in all sorts of game and fish, and we owe it to ourselves, not only for the pleasure of our people, but for their food, that we conserve our game and fish. Fish is a cheap food, it is a valuable food, it is a healthy food, and the Government can do no greater thing than to get behind this movement to restore our depleted fishing industry. I wish the appropriations authorized were four times as much as they are, but I believe that we have made a good start.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. In reference to the language of this bill, what is the difference between a fish-cultural station and a fish-cultural substation?

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman knows the difference between an agent and a subagent. That is the best answer I can give the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Are the oysters fat in North Carolina this year?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Was the gentleman and the President talking about fishing at the Rapidan?

Mr. ABERNETHY. That was before Mr. Hoover went into the undertaking he is now engaged in, which is a very serious one, that of being President. We were talking about going down to North Carolina to do some real fishing, and then when he ran for the Presidency instead of going fishing, we have been unable to get him farther away from Washington on a fishing trip than at the Rapidan.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, after much study and investigating on the part of the Bureau of Fisheries, this bureau has indorsed every item and project in this bill. I am glad to see the committee bringing out a bill proposing a 5-year program. This is a very important line of work, and to successfully carry on this work there should be a sufficient amount of money and a long-time program. Most of the States have been passing laws during the past few years helpful to the carrying out of the plans of the Federal Government in protecting game and fish. My State, South Carolina, is deeply interested in this line of work. We have a wonderful hatchery at Orangeburg, S. C., where I reside, and with the \$25,000 item carried in this bill for South Carolina we will be able to enlarge this hatchery and build a much-needed substation.

One of the troubles to-day is that appropriations are usually so small that the various hatcheries are unable to send out the quantity of fish and the size of fish that they ought to send out so as not to be wasteful in spending the money.

In regard to the question asked by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] a while ago as to the difference between a cultural station and a subcultural station, the substation is a project to which they will transfer the very small fish from the main station or hatchery so as to allow these fish to get to a proper size before shipping them out to the applicants. In shipping out the very small fish from the hatchery so many of them die. We are building in South Carolina one of the largest dams in the country, which will bring about an artificial lake of some 60,000 acres, the Saluda power project, in Lexington County, my district, and with the addition of the funds allotted the Orangeburg hatchery in this bill we will be able to help



those people supply that lake with fish. The output of every hatchery should be large enough to supply fish for the lakes and streams within the State where the hatchery is located as well as all applicants. Every farmer owning a pond or stream on his farm should have it stocked with fish. I am glad to support this bill, with its various items, and hope that it will pass unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I have always been very strong on the fish question. I have looked upon the sea-food products as one of the most important industries in the country. We should do everything that is possible to enlarge the fishing industry and produce more fish. I believe this bill to provide a 5-year plan for the Bureau of Fisheries, when passed and put into operation, will greatly increase the fish supply and help the commercial and pleasure fishing in this country. Some years ago I introduced two bills, one to prevent the use of fish in the manufacture of fertilizer and the other to protect migratory fish. I am frank to say that the protection of migratory fish is dear to my heart, because a part of the great Chesapeake Bay is contained in the State of Virginia and the other part in Maryland. It seemed almost impossible for Maryland and Virginia to get together for the protection of the fish. Crabs gradually diminished, until the catch of crabs became very small. The catch of shad continued to decrease, because of the nets placed at the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay in Virginia. I contended that we have just as much right to protect migratory fish as we have to protect migratory birds. I am proud to say, however, that Maryland and Virginia have been working together better recently. We have in Maryland Mr. Swepson Earle, I think one of the greatest conservation commissioners this country has ever produced, and he has done wonders in protecting the fish and bringing about current legislation, so that we have a better supply than we used to have. It took Maryland and Virginia 100 years to get together on the protection of the oyster industry in the Potomac River, and by the time they did get together there were few oysters, and the District of Columbia by dumping its sewage into the Potomac River is gradually destroying them, so that it makes no difference whether we have oysters there or not.

Mr. BLAND. Does not the gentleman think that this is a splendid opportunity for Virginia and Maryland to get together and try to get the District of Columbia to take care of its sewage?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have been bringing it to the attention of Congress for a great many years, and I am told there is a movement in that direction now. It is a most important matter to the States of Maryland and Virginia, and especially to the District of Columbia.

Mr. SLOAN. I note with a good deal of pleasure the getting together of Maryland and Virginia, and I think the House will be very much interested in the character of their getting together, whether it is in the nature of an embrace or a clinch.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I might say this: We can not get together as we used to in the good old days, but we are still very fraternal.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Emphasizing what the gentleman has said with reference to the depletion of the Potomac River fisheries, I find that prior to the Civil War very often a seine haul would bring in as many as from five to nearly ten thousand shad, whereas now the maximum haul does not ordinarily exceed a few hundred.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes. I want to bring it particularly to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of the members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries that we should try to devise some plan not only for the enlargement of the culture and hatching activities to produce more fish to put into these rivers and lakes, but we should try to frame some legislation, whether by a migratory law or otherwise, by which the Government could protect the fish by and with the consent of the States.

I heard a story some time ago, which I expect may be familiar to most of the gentlemen here, about a road that went along the top of a very deep cliff, possibly 500 feet, where very often travelers going along this road would fall over the cliff and be killed. The city near-by suggested in their municipal council that an ambulance be placed at the foot of this cliff, so that when anybody fell over it there would be no trouble in taking them up and carrying them to the hospital without delay. Thereupon a member of the city council got up and suggested that if they put a wall in front of the cliff there would be no injuries and no need of an ambulance to carry persons to the hospital. If you could frame legislative provisions for the production and conservation of these fish, you would not need to

replenish so intensely, and, if you did, we would have a greater abundance of fish.

I sincerely trust that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will bring out legislation by which we can not only produce more fish but also protect those fish that have already been produced.

When we realize that the commercial fisheries of the United States and Alaska furnish employment for 200,000 fishermen and other persons, we can readily visualize the importance of this industry. The annual catch of fish product amounts to 3,000,000 pounds, valued to the fishermen at \$113,000,000.

The industry has decreased to an alarming extent. The catch of shad has decreased in 30 years from nearly 51,000,000 pounds to less than 15,000,000. Sturgeon 35 years ago were caught to the extent of 18,000,000 pounds, whereas the last recorded year shows a catch of but 1,200,000 pounds.

Many years ago the Atlantic sea salmon ranged the Atlantic coast and entered some 28 streams between New York and the New Brunswick border. This fish is to-day almost extinct. In 1890 the lobster catch of New England was more than 30,000,000 pounds, but for the last year in which statistics are available the catch was but 10,666,000 pounds. The crab catch in Chesapeake Bay has declined from 50,000,000 pounds in 1915 to 23,000,000 pounds in 1920, but through stringent regulations, of which I have already spoken, it had increased in 1925 to 30,000,000 pounds. The salmon fisheries of the Pacific coast have been seriously depleted, and only by stringent regulations has it been possible to prevent exhaustion such as that of Alaska.

Our larger interior waters have likewise suffered. The catch of cisco in Lake Erie declined from 35,000,000 pounds in 1918 to less than 2,500,000 pounds in 1927, and the total fisheries of the Great Lakes, including Lake of the Woods, declined from 149,500,000 pounds in 1918 to a little over 100,000,000 pounds in 1925, a loss of approximately one-third.

It will be seen from what I have said that it is high time that we were enacting some constructive and permanent legislation for the increase of the sea-food supply. This program of five years and the expenditure of \$1,735,000 during that period will be money well invested. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I am glad to indorse the provisions of the pending bill and welcome the opportunity to vote for its passage. Considering the amount to be expended, I believe it means as much to our citizens, to the common people, and all classes as any legislation we have considered during the session.

I have been actively interested in such legislation for years. I am glad that the State which in part I have the honor to represent will, under the terms of the bill, obtain a fish-cultural station, and I am glad to believe that it will soon be possible for every State to obtain sufficient fish and spawn from stations in its own territory to stock its waters when needed. When this has been done the Federal Government will have added much to our national life. Not only will it be an addition to our sporting life but a substantial contribution to health, to agriculture, and to commerce. In many communities the small creeks and rivers have been depleted of their fish. Unless we can provide to restock them, the masses in such localities must and will be deprived of the good effects which are enjoyed by those who reside in communities where such conditions do not exist.

I would like to see it made possible for every farm to have its private fish pond. It would not only add much to rural life but from an agricultural standpoint I believe it would mean much to our people. There is no doubt one can raise more on an acre of water than on an acre of land, and in most cases the profit is greater. It does not need to be fertilized or cultivated, only confined. It gives the family the threefold privilege of sport, edible diet, and healthful exercise.

Most of the older States have little fishing opportunities now. When I was a boy we had thousands and thousands of shad. We have practically none at this time. Why? Simply because we have had no worth-while conservation policy in the State and no facilities for restocking our streams. But we are now improving both as regards fish and game in Georgia. We now have good fish and game laws and the first real efficient commissioner within my recollection. Heretofore we have torn down and destroyed the very thing that meant much to the fish and game life of Georgia, but Mr. Twitty, our present commissioner, is rebuilding and conserving along progressive lines, and

a few more years of such administration will restore the State to that splendid position it once enjoyed.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KADING].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KADING. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will not take up much of the time of the committee in connection with this legislation. I simply desire to call your attention to the fact that I believe this bill is legislation in the right direction.

When we consider the vast amounts of money that we are appropriating from time to time in Congress in connection with maintaining our Government it should be a great pleasure for us to come to a point where we can make provision for the spending of what I consider merely a nominal sum, merely a "drop in the bucket," for a purpose and object which all the people of the United States are so immensely interested in.

The question of fishing and fisheries and an ample supply of fish is something that almost every man, woman, and child is interested in. It is not necessary to spend any time in calling attention to the great enjoyment and benefit that the people receive from an ample supply of fish in our rivers and other bodies of water. Fish are rapidly being taken out of their native element, and we should have our lakes and streams replenished for the enjoyment of the people in the sport in fishing and the food that an ample supply of fish provide.

If I remember correctly, this program, spread over a period of five years, means merely an expenditure of about \$1,735,000. I sincerely hope that there will be no opposition to this bill whatsoever.

As has been stated, it was reported out unanimously by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries; it is nearly identical to the bill reported out unanimously by that committee about a year ago. It was passed by the House and the Senate, and in the closing days of the Seventieth Congress it was lost in the shuffle and did not receive the approval of President Coolidge. Everybody is interested in this legislation and I believe it should be promptly passed by Congress and approved by the President.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KADING. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. I would like to inquire about an item that was in the bill last year for Cape Vincent, N. Y. There seems to be an item here, "New York, \$35,000," but that is rather generic. My understanding was that the propagation of black bass was to be continued or stimulated at Cape Vincent on the St. Lawrence River. Can the gentleman who has the floor or the chairman of the committee tell me something about that item?

Mr. BRIGGS. The Bureau of Fisheries reports that is being carried on out of current appropriations; that it has existing authority to do that.

Mr. CULKIN. Is the gentleman from Texas advised that the continuation of that work is provided for in current appropriation?

Mr. BRIGGS. It will be, as current appropriations are made.

Mr. CULKIN. And that is the definite policy of the Department of Fisheries?

Mr. BRIGGS. The Commissioner of Fisheries reported with reference to Cape Vincent that \$25,000 is expected to complete this work with current appropriations. That was his report to the committee.

Mr. CULKIN. Of course, that is a rather important type of game fish, and it must be protected or it will disappear.

Mr. BRIGGS. I think the Commissioner of Fisheries indicated very clearly his interest in the maintenance of that work, and his attention was especially invited to it when he made the statement that it was intended to carry that on out of current appropriations.

Mr. CULKIN. What is the item, "New York, \$35,000"? Is this work included in that?

Mr. BRIGGS. It is a separate item for the State, to be subsequently located, at the instance of the Commissioner of Fisheries.

Mr. CULKIN. They are the sole arbiters of that?

Mr. BRIGGS. They are the sole arbiters of that.

Mr. CULKIN. And that is the policy of the committee?

Mr. BRIGGS. I may say that is the policy of the administration and the Bureau of Fisheries and the Department of Commerce, as the gentleman knows, having served on the same committee.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KADING. I yield.

Mr. SLOAN. I note the gentleman's desire to pass the bill. I was wondering if he would submit to a small amendment

which I think may improve the bill. On page 1, line 11, substitute "Nebraska" for the word "Wisconsin." [Laughter.]

Mr. KADING. As much as I love my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] I do not love him sufficiently to prompt me to consent to his modest request for such substitution. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including line 10 on page 4.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 3 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the same privilege of returning to section 2. It has been read so fast that I could not follow it. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 1, section 2.

Mr. BLAND. Reserving the right to object, what amendment is it that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] desires to offer?

Mr. LEHLBACH. For projects in Minnesota and Mississippi which have been approved by the Bureau of Fisheries, subsequent to the reporting of this bill, and which had the approval of the Bureau of Fisheries and have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and are among the projects approved by the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. In case the request of the gentleman from New Jersey is granted, as I understand the section will be returned to for only one purpose, to offer that particular amendment, and the section will not be open for other amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has made request to return for only one purpose.

Mr. LEHLBACH. For the purpose of offering two amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has indicated the amendments he proposes to offer.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The amendments deal with projects in Minnesota and Mississippi, respectively.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. There is no objection to that, as far as I am concerned, the request being limited to those two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH]?

Mr. HARE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, do I understand the chairman of the committee agrees in his request that we should also return to section 2 for the purpose of offering an amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE]?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I have not expressed myself on that at all. The chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries finds himself in the unfortunate position that, with the rapid reading of the bill and the buzz of conversation, and having people come to him and asking questions, he lost track of where the Clerk was reading. He is at the mercy of the committee with respect to the right to return to the section to offer amendments which have been agreed to and properly belong in the bill.

Mr. HARE. It is not my purpose to object, but I understood the gentleman from Wisconsin has requested also to return to section 2, and I was wondering whether the two requests were embodied in one.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I have expressed no judgment or opinion at all upon any other request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that only one unanimous-consent request will be disposed of at a time. Then it will be in order to make another.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 3, line 10, after the figures "\$75,000," strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the words and figures "Minnesota, \$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.



The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LEHLBACH: On page 3, line 22, after the figures "\$75,000," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: "A fish-cultural substation in Mississippi, in the southern part of the State, \$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 2 on page 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to section 2, on page 1. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for what purpose does the gentleman desire to return to this section?

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment. As my friend, the chairman of the committee, said, there was so much confusion that I could not follow the Clerk reading the bill and we passed over the part to which I desired to propose an amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Since there has been so much confusion, I shall not object to returning to this section; but I sincerely hope that the House will vote down the amendment which the gentleman will offer and pass the bill with the Wisconsin fish-cultural substation designated as requested by the department and approved by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries by their unanimous vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNE: On page 1, line 11, after the word "Wisconsin," strike out "in the southern part of the," and on page 2, line 1, the word "State."

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, the bill as it reads proposes to limit the location of the hatchery, or cultural fish station, in Wisconsin to the southern part of the State.

Everyone who knows anything about the State of Wisconsin knows that there are 50 lakes north of the central part of the State to 1 south of the central part of the State.

I introduced a bill which proposed a cultural fish station in the State of Wisconsin, but it does not designate the part of the State in which the station should be located. I do not think the Bureau of Fisheries should be limited to any part of a State unless there is some unusual circumstance or condition which would cause the belief that the Bureau of Fisheries would not do the right thing in locating the station, or would be influenced by prejudice.

Here is the great State of Wisconsin, something over 400 miles north and south, and if the law provides that this hatchery should be located in the southern part of the State, the Bureau of Fisheries would be compelled to locate it in the southern part of the State. I can not see any objection to the adoption of an amendment which would give the Bureau of Fisheries the whole State of Wisconsin in which to make a selection of what it believes the best place for the hatchery. If it should be found that the central part, the western part, the eastern part, the northern part, or the southern part was the best place for the location, all things being considered, the Bureau of Fisheries could locate the station there. This amendment would simply give the bureau the fullest discretion in locating the hatchery.

The bill as now drawn would limit the Bureau of Fisheries to the southern part of the State. I understand this is going to be a cultural fish station for bass, and there are not nearly as many lakes in the southern part of the State as in the western part of the State, the eastern part of the State, or the northern part of the State. I do not ask that they shall locate this hatchery in the northern or central part of the State. I merely want to give the Bureau of Fisheries the fullest discretion in locating this hatchery.

If you will examine the bill you will find there are only one or two exceptions where the bill designates the part of the State where the hatchery must be located. Practically all of the locations are left to the discretion of the bureau, to locate the station wherever it thinks best. I can not understand why Wisconsin should be singled out and this exception made as to the location of a cultural fish station in this State, unless it is because there is a member from Wisconsin on the committee who comes from the southern part of the State. I can not understand why they should designate the southern part of the State and say that the Bureau of Fisheries shall not look over the

entire State and locate this hatchery in the best place in the State, no matter in what part of the State the location may be made. If the bill should pass as now drawn, the Bureau of Fisheries would be in a position to say that the location has been provided for by law, that their hands are tied and they are forced to locate this station in the southern part of the State. However, I do not think this is good legislation. The Bureau of Fisheries is a disinterested party and its officials are experts technically versed in fish culture and are believed to know more about the location of hatcheries than anyone else, so I do not see any purpose in limiting their discretion in this matter by saying they shall locate this hatchery in the southern part of the State.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNE. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Does not the gentleman know this is the report of the Fish Commission?

Mr. BROWNE. I have talked over the phone with the office of the Bureau of Fisheries but could not get the commissioner himself. I can not see why the bureau would desire to have a limitation placed upon them; if they want to locate this station in the southern part of the State there is nothing in my amendment which will prevent them from doing so. Under my amendment they are not limited to any part of the State. My amendment gives them the right to carefully look over the whole State of Wisconsin, and if they desire to place this station in the southern part of Wisconsin there is nothing in my amendment which would prevent them from doing so. I can not see that my amendment could possibly do any injury, because it only gives the Fish Commission the right to make a survey of the entire State and familiarize themselves with opportunities available and then select the best place in the State for a cultural fish station. They have this right in 95 per cent of all the places named in this bill. Why should Wisconsin be made an exception?

Mr. KADING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very sorry I must differ with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE]. The gentleman said that he could not see why the southern portion of Wisconsin should be designated as a location for the fish hatchery contemplated for Wisconsin in this legislation just because there was a member on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee from the southern part of Wisconsin. I am sorry my colleague [Mr. BROWNE] used this language, because such a consideration did not enter into the question by the committee in any way whatsoever in the preparation of this bill.

My friends, this is a national movement. This bill provides for fish hatcheries on a national scope. Various States have State fish hatcheries, Wisconsin has very many of them. I do not know the exact number, I believe there are between 17 and 23 State fish hatcheries in the State of Wisconsin, a good share of them being in the northern part of the State. The Bureau of Fisheries, my colleagues had in mind, in connection with recommending the legislation that is embodied in this bill, the fact that they are very much in need of a hatchery located in the State of Wisconsin from which bass could be furnished to the States of Indiana and Illinois. And that is the reason that the southern part of Wisconsin was proposed for a Federal fish hatchery.

If you will look over the bill you will find there are more than two other States where similar language is used, and where this bill provides and designates that the hatcheries are to be located in certain portions of those States, such as in New Hampshire (in the White Mountains), in Tennessee (in the middle division of the State), in Texas (in the western part of the State), in Virginia (in the eastern part of the State), in Texas (on the Gulf coast); and, if I am not mistaken, there are various other places indicated in the bill specifying in what sections of States these hatcheries are proposed for.

I want to say to you, my colleagues, if you yield in the consideration of an amendment of this kind, so far as one State is concerned, you will open up the matter and Members from other States will allow selfish motives and personal matters to enter into the consideration of the bill, desiring to have such fish hatcheries located conveniently to them, and this will destroy the purpose and the intention of the legislation.

I hope you will stand by the committee that reported the bill out in this form unanimously with the indorsement of the various departments and defeat the proposed amendment.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I regret that I must oppose the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE]. The gentleman from Wisconsin



[Mr. KADING] who is a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has correctly stated that this is not a State but a national proposition. The Bureau of Fisheries has carefully considered and studied the whole expansion program, not only taking into consideration the State of Wisconsin in so far as this Wisconsin project is concerned, but the general set-up throughout the Nation, particularly among the States bordering on the great State of Wisconsin.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] who offered the pending amendment would lead the Members of the House to believe that the Wisconsin project is the only one that is set out with a designation in a particular section of the State. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KADING] has called your attention to other specific designations with respect to certain portions of States for similar projects, so I will not burden you with a recapitulation of the facts which he has presented.

It is my understanding that we now have a Federal fisheries station in the northern part of Wisconsin at La Crosse.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I would say, for the benefit of the gentleman and the committee, the Fish Commissioner designated these places. This bill has the absolute approval of the Bureau of Fisheries, and if we were to strike this out we would run against a snag there.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Absolutely. This whole expansion program, as embodied in the bill now under consideration, is a well thought out program from a national standpoint, every project not being considered on its own individual merits, but being considered in conjunction with every other project. Since the Government bureau concerned has approved this expansion program as embodied in the bill, and since the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House has unanimously reported out this project with the Wisconsin designation as now carried in the bill, I sincerely hope the committee will vote down the amendment offered by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] by an almost unanimous vote and stand by the department and stand by the committee reporting the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I simply wish to state that the locations of stations was incorporated in this bill after careful study over several years by the Bureau of Fisheries, and at the hearing the reasons for each location were at length presented to the committee and the committee approved them. We earnestly hope this well-thought-out and well-rounded program of the experts in charge of our fish conservation and development will not be interfered with.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 2, page 2, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman desire to introduce an amendment?

Mr. HARE. That is my purpose; yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is the gentleman serious about it?

Mr. HARE. Yes; very serious.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is not South Carolina well provided for?

Mr. HARE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 19, strike out "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret very much that the committee, in reporting this bill, did not see fit to grant the full \$50,000 asked for originally by my colleague [Mr. FULMER].

I was very much disappointed to find that the appropriation for enlarging the fish hatchery and its activities in South Carolina has been reduced to \$25,000, whereas all the other States provided for have an appropriation for more than \$25,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There are a great many things stricken out of the original bill. This is all that we can get, and it is a wonder that we got anything at all for North and South

Carolina. We finally got everybody to agree to it. I think if the gentleman undertakes to open this matter he may have some trouble about retaining what we now have.

Mr. HARE. It is my intention to support the bill, but I want to emphasize, in the short time allotted me, the necessity for increasing the appropriation for enlarging the work of the fish hatchery in South Carolina. As it is now we are receiving very poor service, not because those in charge are not efficient, but because their equipment is not sufficient to supply the demands. In my State we have to wait from 10 to 18 months or 2 years to get our applications filled, because they tell us at the bureau that the fish are not available, and they are therefore unable to take care of all of the requests. The appropriation, therefore, ought to be increased so as to enable them to supply the demands; and for this reason I am asking for the small increase of \$25,000.

Furthermore, the fish we have been receiving are not more than an inch long, and some of the applicants write me that after their orders have been filled they have only received 50 fish or less. Gentlemen, we are undertaking here to enlarge the work, and I am asking this committee to treat South Carolina as well as it treats the State of North Carolina and many other States, and give us enough money to enlarge this fish hatchery so that they will be able to comply with the requests that come from people throughout the State, including some from southern North Carolina and the eastern part of Georgia.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, this item is for the purpose of enlarging the station in South Carolina. Has the gentleman any information to give the committee as to the proposed enlargement as proposed by the Bureau of Fisheries, that the cost will exceed \$25,000?

Mr. HARE. I can not do that; but I can say that I know the necessity for an enlargement will call for more than \$25,000.

Mr. LEHLBACH. The Bureau of Fisheries is interested in the project and has recommended it and desires to be authorized to receive the money to provide for the enlargement. They say that they can do it for \$25,000. What good purpose would be served by increasing the appropriation?

Mr. HARE. I do not know whether the bureau is interested or not, but I do know that my constituents are constantly complaining to the effect that they have to wait a year or so before their applications receive attention, and then they only receive enough fish, as they say, to stock a mudhole. My idea is to increase the appropriation so as to take care of the demands by the people of the State, and if the bureau were interested enough to see that this hatchery were large enough to meet the demands, its recommendation would have been for \$50,000 or more and this amendment would not have been necessary. I have not filed an application for fish within the five years I have served in Congress and received a reply advising that the request would be complied with any time soon, but invariably I have been advised that the demand was greater than the supply and that my constituent would have to wait "with time and patience" until his application could be reached, and in some cases it is a year or two before they are reached, and then there would not be enough fish to fill a teacup.

For the information of the House I want to show what the bill carries for other States: New Mexico, \$50,000; Idaho, \$60,000; Wisconsin, \$50,000; Montana, \$35,000; Colorado, \$35,000; Washington, \$125,000; West Virginia or Maryland, \$75,000; Alabama, \$50,000; Indiana, \$50,000; Tennessee, \$50,000; Pennsylvania, \$100,000; Texas, \$105,000; New York, \$35,000; Florida, \$60,000; Maine, \$50,000; Virginia, \$75,000; Nevada, \$60,000; Illinois, \$75,000; New Jersey, \$75,000; Ohio, \$35,000; Kansas, \$35,000; North Dakota, \$35,000; Georgia, \$35,000; far-away Alaska, \$50,000; and South Carolina, where we have shown there is an unusual demand for increased facilities, the appropriation is only \$25,000. I sincerely hope that the amendment may be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am a great believer in taking care of all of the Carolinas. I think the best way to take care of them is to go along and get what you can, and, after you get the camel's nose under the tent, then you can do pretty well. [Laughter.]

Now, they have cut some out of the bill so far as I am concerned, as the committee knows. We have an Appropriations Committee, with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], and some other gentlemen, who are very fair with appropriations, and I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he, in my judgment, can get further aid, if needed, from that source. I went before that Appropriations Committee and got something



over \$100,000 to take care of pressing needs in my State. I think the gentleman should go along with us, and I can assure him that we will aid him, as far as I am concerned, for the benefit of South Carolina, in every way possible.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am sorry that my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] suggested that it was necessary to be on the committee in order to receive consideration for projects and have his proposition approved. I am sure that, upon reflection, the gentleman will realize that he did an injustice to himself and an injustice to the committee. There is not a project in this bill which has been considered by any of the members of the committee with respect to his particular district or his State.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I want the gentleman to understand that there was nothing ulterior in my suggestion that if I had been on the committee I would have gotten something. The point I was making was that if I had been on the committee I would have been in a position to convince the committee of the necessity of making this increased appropriation.

Mr. BLAND. And I say to the gentleman that as a Member of this House if he desired to appear before the committee, the committee would have given him the same consideration that it would have given if he had been a member of the committee. In fact, I may add that I believe the committee would have given him probably a little more consideration, because it has been the purpose of the committee, so far as I have observed it since I have been on it, to eliminate favoritism to members of the committee and partisan consideration of any measures that come before it. They are two things that do not enter into the workings of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that we absolutely followed the recommendation of the department?

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am just going to bring to the attention of the House the statement of the Commissioner of Fisheries in this respect:

South Carolina, substation: For enlargement of Orangeburg station, from \$35,000 to \$25,000. Investigations made at Orangeburg station have shown \$25,000 will be required to complete the building program for the enlargement of the station. The improvements made since the first bill was drawn makes the reduction possible.

It is for that reason, upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Fisheries, that this report is made for \$25,000 instead of \$35,000 as formerly. If we open up the bill for enlargements here and there and increases, there is no assurance that we would be able to get the bill through or that it would meet with the approval of the administration. Though I do this with considerable reluctance, because of my warm personal friendship for the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], I ask the Committee of the Whole to support the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. (a) The stations, substations, and laboratories authorized by sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 shall be located in the States and parts thereof and in the Territory specified, at such suitable points as may be selected by the Secretary of Commerce.

(b) Any appropriation made under authority of sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 may be expended for the purchase of sites, and the purchase of equipment, the construction of buildings and ponds, and for such other expenses as may be incidental to the cost of the establishment, purchase, or enlargement, as the case may be, of the station, substation, or laboratory in question.

(c) No part of an appropriation made under authority of section 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 shall be expended in the construction, purchase, or enlargement of a station or substation until the State in which such station or substation is to be located shall have by legislative action accorded to the United States Commissioner of Fisheries and his duly authorized agents the right to conduct fish hatching and fish culture and all operations connected therewith in any manner and at any time that may by the commissioner be considered necessary and proper, any laws of the State to the contrary notwithstanding. The operation of any station, substation, or laboratory established, purchased, or enlarged under authority of this act shall be discontinued whenever the State ceases to accord such right; and such operation may be suspended by the Secretary of Commerce whenever in his judgment State laws or regulations affecting fishes cultivated are allowed to remain so inadequate as to impair the efficiency of such station, substation, or laboratory.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 5, line 22, after the word "laboratory," insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(d) That the authorizations herein given in sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 with reference to appropriations for certain specified years are for the purpose of indicating priority supposed to be given to various projects enumerated therein, but shall not be held to require appropriations enumerated to be made in the years specified, and the appropriations enumerated are likewise authorized in prior or subsequent years in annual or supplemental appropriation acts."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to all other amounts authorized by law to be appropriated the following amounts during the fiscal years specified:

(1) For the purpose of providing adequate maintenance costs and personnel for the division of fish culture, Bureau of Fisheries: Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$100,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$200,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$300,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$400,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$500,000. Of each amount authorized by this paragraph to be appropriated, 30 per cent is authorized for salaries at the seat of government and elsewhere.

(2) To meet the demand for fundamental knowledge regarding our great commercial fisheries and for developing the natural cultivation of oysters, mussels, and other mollusca, and the improvement of pond cultural and other operations of the division of inquiry, Bureau of Fisheries, respecting food fishes: Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$75,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$150,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$180,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$240,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$300,000. Of each amount authorized by this paragraph to be appropriated 40 per cent is authorized for salaries at the seat of government and elsewhere, and not to exceed \$10,000 in any year for a survey of the fisheries of the Hawaiian Islands.

(3) To provide for the proper husbandry of our fisheries, improvements in methods of capture, merchandising, and distribution of our fishery harvest, including saving and utilization of waste products, and other operations of the division of fishery industries, Bureau of Fisheries: Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$35,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$70,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$105,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$140,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$175,000. Of each amount authorized by this paragraph to be appropriated 40 per cent is authorized for salaries at the seat of government and elsewhere.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 6, line 1, after the comma following the word "appropriation," insert "not to exceed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 6, in line 10, after the comma following the word "appropriated," insert "not more than."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 6, lines 17 to 21, strike out the colon and the language, "Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$75,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$150,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$180,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$240,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$300,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: A comma and the language, "sufficient annual additions to increase present appropriations by not to exceed \$300,000 per annum at the conclusion of the construction program authorized in this act."

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHLBACH. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. This does not increase the total amount?

Mr. LEHLBACH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers another amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 6, line 22, after the word "appropriated" insert the words "not more than."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 7, lines 6 to 9, inclusive, strike out the colon and the following language, "Fiscal year beginning July 1, 1930, \$35,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1931, \$70,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1932, \$105,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1933, \$140,000; fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, \$175,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: A comma and the language, "sufficient annual additions to increase the present appropriation by not exceeding \$175,000 per annum at the conclusion of the construction program authorized in this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: On page 7, line 11, after the word "appropriated," insert "not more than."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEHLBACH: Page 7, line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 8. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Bureau of Fisheries may cooperate with States, counties, municipalities, individuals, and public and private commissions, organizations and institutions, and may accept donations of land, funds, and other aid to the development of this program."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say the program presented here is one that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives has been trying to give to the people of the United States for a number of years. We have encountered all sorts of difficulty and delays. From time to time questions have been raised by the Budget and the administration regarding its financial program; and the bill passed last year failed to receive Executive approval. We have redrafted the bill and woven into it the thought of the Bureau of Fisheries and the administration so as to overcome all objections. This measure is intended to serve the country to the fullest degree.

There may be instances, perhaps, which may be regarded as not presenting as well-balanced a program as ought to be submitted, but that is due to the fact that the Bureau of Fisheries has insisted that in some States existing facilities are sufficient while in other States the communities have suffered by being too far away from sources of supply and the supply of fish has been inadequate. The bureau in some instances is almost two years behind in filling applications for fish; there are 10,000 applications pending which can not be acted upon for a considerable length of time unless this program is carried into effect without undue delay.

This bill gives the Atlantic, the Pacific, Great Lakes, and Gulf States a fairly equitable distribution of hatcheries, and it has given the Gulf its first opportunity for a fisheries laboratory, so that not only the propagation of fish can be undertaken

but the habits, supply, and development of both shell and fin varieties of salt-water fish be extensively investigated and necessary biological studies connected with fish life, foods, and growth may be conducted along adequate, comprehensive, and scientific lines.

It is particularly gratifying to me that a fisheries laboratory, combining both a fish hatchery and a laboratory for a scientific study of both shell and fin fish and related problems, has been authorized in this measure to be constructed and operated on the eastern coast of Texas, at or near Galveston, and thereby fill an especially long-felt need for such a Government facility.

The efforts which I have constantly made in connection with a number of bills introduced for such purpose to bring about this result are fully compensated for by the assurance of the inestimable value which this marine laboratory will possess not only for the people of Texas but wherever contact is had with the Gulf of Mexico and the wonderful fish foods and products which exist there.

The increasing recognition of the value of both shell and fin fish as a necessary part of a wholesome, beneficial, and appetizing element of the food of the Nation has resulted in a constantly increasing demand for both fresh and salt water fish.

Dr. E. V. McCollum, professor of chemical hygiene, Johns Hopkins University, recently stated:

Modern researches on foods and nutrition have brought to light many surprises, both as regards the nutritive needs of the body and the dietary properties of individual foodstuffs, among which the most marked contrasts have been found. In no case have any foods gained more recognition as having unique dietary values than have the principal fish and shellfish.

The United States Bureau of Fisheries calls attention to the fact that—

Our per capita consumption of fish is low in comparison with other nations which maintain important fisheries. In Newfoundland the per capita consumption exceeds 100 pounds; Japan, 58 pounds; Sweden, 52 pounds; Norway, 44 pounds; Denmark, 39 pounds; Portugal, 37 pounds; England, 35 pounds; Canada, 29 pounds; Netherlands, 29 pounds; and Germany, 18 pounds; while our own per capita consumption is about 15 pounds.

In addition to the commercial production of about 3,000,000,000 pounds of fish annually within waters of the United States, there has also been a stimulated interest in fishing throughout the country by reason of the easy access to lakes, streams, and the sea afforded by excellent highways and the automobile.

It is evident that to meet the present and growing national demand for fish steps must be taken to increase immediately the Government hatcheries, cultural stations, and marine laboratories.

Practically little or nothing has been done by our Government in the last 10 years to meet the need and demand for increased hatcheries. The few auxiliary and substations authorized have been hopelessly inadequate.

In this connection, however, I do not in the least desire to intimate any want of interest or lack of appreciation of the existing situation by the Bureau of Fisheries under the direction of its most capable and experienced commissioner, the Hon. Henry O'Malley.

Both the commissioner and his bureau have long recognized and endeavored to overcome, with the limited resources at their command, the difficulties presented by lack of adequate hatchery and laboratory facilities; but they can not supply fish to restock streams, lakes, and coastal waters of the United States when the only available Government hatcheries are unable to produce enough fish to meet national needs.

Your committee is also conscious of the fact that it is not sufficient for the Bureau of Fisheries to propagate fish in increasingly large numbers; it is further necessary that constant and careful scientific study must be devoted to many biological and other problems affecting the life and growth of oysters, clams, crabs, shrimp, lobsters, and other shell fish, as well as many varieties of finned fish in both fresh and sea waters.

The resources and facilities of the United States Bureau of Fisheries are not and have not been for some time past sufficient to supply various areas of the United States with necessary experts to carry on investigations and studies regarding the causes for much of the destruction and injury to many varieties of shell and fin fish, or to acquaint the Government with sufficient knowledge of the habits, migration, and best methods of cultivation of certain valuable fish in various waters of the United States, or to make a more extensive study of the value of other varieties of fish as food, and of an increase in the uses to which such fish foods may be devoted and forms in which they may be prepared and shipped to meet the increasing demand for such foods.



The returns which the comparatively small authorization and necessary appropriations will bring to the people of the United States will be many fold greater than the Government investment and will contribute materially to the health and happiness of millions of people throughout the Nation.

I sincerely hope that the bill will not only be passed by the House but passed unanimously; so as to give fitting expression to the sentiment of the House in favor of this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7405) to provide for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries, reported that that committee had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LEHLBACH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Members of the House have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this bill carrying an appropriation of \$3,555,000, to be expended for the construction of fish-cultural stations throughout America and its Territories and for certain current expenditures of the department, is a most constructive conservation measure. It makes provision for the propagation and culture of fish throughout America wherever there are coastal and inland waters suitable for that purpose. The disappearance of game and food fish is due to indiscreet fishing and to the unavoidable effect of civilization on certain kinds of fish life. Through this bill we are in a fair way to restore to nature what has been taken away.

As was stated by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], acting chairman of the committee, in his introductory remarks on this bill, the decrease in the catch of certain fish is alarming and the salvation of fish as a food product is dependent upon artificial cultivation, which is provided for in this bill.

#### PRESIDENT HOOVER AN AERDENT CONSERVATIONIST

I commit no breach of confidence when I say the present occupant of the White House, long before he entered upon his present exalted duties and while Secretary of Commerce, was a strong advocate of this measure. It may be said that he is the father of it. When this bill reaches him he will sign it gladly. The extremely high character of the personnel of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is, however, sufficient guaranty for this measure. No committee of the House is clearer visioned or more unselfish than the Merchant Marine Committee. I served on this committee for a time and know the worth and ability of the gentlemen constituting it.

#### THE GLORIES OF THE ST. LAWRENCE

Every citizen is a potential fisherman. The lure of the catch and the open spaces is in the blood of the average man and boy. Each disciple of Izaak Walton has his own favorite fishing ground. He has his own type of game fish with which he loves to battle. For myself I prefer that "fighting egotist," the small-mouth bass.

This gentleman among game fish has his chief habitat at the foot of Lake Ontario and the glorious regions in and about the St. Lawrence River. Here are great stretches of clear, pure water free from the contamination of civilization. Here are miles after miles of clean gravelly bottom over which he may disport himself and rear his young. He is the most vigorous

fighter for his length and weight in the entire fish family. He is discriminating in the selection of his environment. Here in these waters is the tiger of the inland seas, the hard-fighting muskellunge. Nothing in nature surpasses him in gameness.

I recently renewed my youth by reading Cooper's Pathfinder. A part of the scene of this book is laid among the Thousand Islands of the St. Lawrence. Cooper does full justice to this glorious region. These beautiful islands, by which pass the waters of the Great Lakes on their way to the sea, rank well up among the scenic wonders of the world. Nowhere is the foliage more gloriously green. Nature is thoroughly alive and there is none of the decay which is typical in the southern or tropical landscape. There are long days of brilliant sunshine with the air actually opalescent. Nowhere in the world are the skies more wonderful than in this region during the period of summer. It is the true playground of America with its combination of islands, sport, and on-rushing river. Nor will the approaching canalization, with the accompanying power development of this great stream, affect its natural beauty. This will occur in the lower stretches of the river, below the islands.

The hospitality of the people of this region is unbounded. Nature lovers and sportsmen are assured of a hearty welcome. I am assured by the committee that the current bill carries an appropriation of \$25,000 for carrying on the work at Cape Vincent, which is in the St. Lawrence River. There the program is to propagate small-mouth bass, whitefish, and lake trout to be returned to the waters I have described.

#### COMMERCIAL FISHING ON LAKE ONTARIO

From the broader reaches of Lake Ontario adjacent to the Thousand Islands which I have described come the lake trout and whitefish. Seeking these fish the hardy fisherman of the region lay nets the gangs of which are sometimes 4 miles in length. Braving the storms and cold of April, when the ice is not yet out of the lake, these hardy fishermen defy wind and weather to help feed civilization. These fishermen are a hardy, venturesome breed, but hospitable and courteous to the stranger who comes into their midst. On the Canadian side from the Main Duck Islands, out of sight of the mainland, they fish regardless of weather from April until October. Their catch is brought to Cape Vincent, N. Y., and there distributed to the great cities of the East. In the old days these fishermen used sail and "the white ash breeze." Now their labors are lessened by the introduction of the gasoline engine with which their boats are now powered. The introduction of the gasoline engine and the installation of power net pullers have resulted in greater catches, with the result that the supply of these wonderful fish would be exhausted except for the work of the Bureaus of Fisheries on the American and Canadian sides. Lake Ontario is part in American and part in Canadian waters. I have long stressed the fact that a fish is not a "national," and the propagation of fish by either country results in evenly distributed benefits to both. It is only by the most intelligent and active cooperation between the American and Canadian Bureaus of Fisheries that Lake Ontario will be kept properly stocked. I trust this cooperation may be present in the future even more fully than it has been in the past.

#### A GREAT INDUSTRY

Our fishery resources afford not only healthful recreation to millions of anglers but are an important source of food and products used in the arts and industries. I understand that at the present time the fishery harvest amounts to over 3,000,000,000 pounds per year, bringing to the 127,000 fishermen a return of \$113,000,000. The food fishes come to us in many different forms—as fresh, packaged, frozen, canned, smoked, salted, and dried. The canning industry alone supplies us with over 330,000,000 pounds of salmon and 180,000,000 pounds of sardines; 50,000,000 pounds of mackerel and tuna and 35,000,000 pounds of shellfish, including oysters, clams, and shrimp. I believe all will agree with me as to the importance of properly conserving this great resource that our people may find healthful recreation, may have available in abundance the delicacies of the sea and those products so valuable to industries.

#### CONSERVATION PROBLEM

Because of the fact that there is no general ownership of fish and fisheries as of lands, the administration of this great resource has been greatly complicated. The study of life in the waters itself is a very complex problem, fraught with many more difficulties than those ordinarily encountered on land.

#### BUREAU'S SERVICE FAR FLUNG

The bureau's service is a far-flung service, with 77 stations and substations in 36 States, the Territory of Alaska, and the District of Columbia. For the distribution of its output it has five specially equipped railway cars for carrying these live forms of life. These cars travel annually over 100,000 miles, and detached messenger shipments cover an additional 300,000 miles in



an effort to keep our waterways stocked. In recent years there has been a growing demand for larger fish for stocking purposes rather than the baby fry newly hatched from the eggs. To meet this demand the bureau has been cooperating with private organizations, fish and game clubs throughout the land. To 114 of these operated last year, there were allotted over 5,000,000 baby trout, which were reared to the fingerling stage for planting in native waters at an age when they were better able to care for themselves. I am advised that this cooperative arrangement is working out very well, some of them claiming to have developed as good fishing as ever existed in their waters. Of these 114 cooperatives, 44 were in Wisconsin, 30 in Pennsylvania, 13 in Minnesota, and 8 in New York.

The bureau also has, in addition to its laboratory in Washington, D. C., three biological stations. One of these is located in Woods Hole, Mass., and is world renowned for the highly scientific work carried on at that point. The second marine station is found at Beaufort, N. C., catering to the needs of the South Atlantic and Gulf States. In the Mississippi Valley, at Fairport, Iowa, there is a fresh-water biological laboratory given over to the problems of experimental fish culture and the maintenance of the supply of fresh-water mussels, the basis of the highly important pearl-button industry of that region.

The Pittsford, Vt., station is given over to experiments with trouts and other cold-water species. In addition, by the conduct of selective breeding experiment efforts are being made to rear strains of trout which will grow more rapidly, give a higher yield of eggs, produce young fish of more uniform size and fish which are more disease resistant than is the wild stock.

There are researches to aid the development of oyster farming and the growing of fresh-water mussels. Although we hear but little of the latter, I understand these shells enabled our manufacturers to produce over 20,000,000 gross of pearl buttons last year, or 24 buttons for every one of our great population.

While I am not as familiar as many of my fellow members with the effectiveness of the work of the Bureau of Fisheries in the past, I wish to pay a tribute to the present Commissioner of Fisheries and to his fellow workers who are doing their best to meet the needs of State authorities, of the anglers, and the commercial fishing interests.

#### COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY A REAL LEADER IN THIS FIELD

Henry O'Malley, the present commissioner, is an outstanding figure in the conservation world. He has long been a leader in the application of scientific research to the fisheries and in developing a program of fisheries conservation to insure the maintenance of this great natural resource. Born in St. Johnsbury, Vt., March 22, 1876, he entered the service of the United States Bureau of Fisheries at the St. Johnsbury Station in 1897. During the 33 years in the bureau's service, Mr. O'Malley advanced through the various grades, including superintendent of Washington's stations, Chief of Division of Fish Culture, chief of Pacific coast operations, being appointed Commissioner of Fisheries May 13, 1922. In 1916 he was elected president of the Pacific Coast Fisheries Society and in 1918 president of the American Fisheries Society, both scientific fishery organizations.

Mr. O'Malley has made important contributions to current fish cultural practices, especially with respect to the salmon. For three years prior to becoming commissioner he spent the entire fishing seasons in Alaska with Dr. Charles H. Gilbert, of Stanford University, in making comprehensive investigations of the fisheries of Alaska, which have since become the basis for sound regulations. Since becoming commissioner he has continued his close supervision over the salmon fisheries. Acting under the White law of 1924, the regulations have been greatly strengthened and the decline of the runs of salmon checked. Faced with much criticism of his vigorous policy at the start, most of his critics now recognize the soundness of his judgment.

One of Mr. O'Malley's first moves on becoming commissioner was to center the activities of the bureau's biologists on major scientific problems of the highly important fisheries. Regional directors in charge of operations have been set up and the work of this division is now generally recognized as being highly practical and necessary to a sound program of fish husbandry. He has also developed a program of experimental fish culture to insure the bureau's spending its funds for the propagation of game and food fishes wisely. An ardent angler himself, he never loses an opportunity to further the interests of the sportsmen. He has been particularly interested in the adequate development of the Mississippi Wild Life and Fish Refuge, to make of this region an angler's paradise.

The bureau's vessel service has been almost wholly rebuilt, antiquated vessels being replaced by modern ones capable of carrying out their work with safety and economy.

In the field of foreign affairs the bureau under Mr. O'Malley has accomplished more in the past eight years than in the previous quarter of a century. An international convention with Great Britain for the saving of the North Pacific halibut fisheries is being successfully carried out, on the Pacific coast a federation of all scientific workers studying the salmon has been formed for the sake of closer cooperation and the avoidance of duplication. Coordinated studies between Canada and the United States with respect to the Great Lakes fisheries and the important bank fisheries of the North Atlantic are in progress and a new treaty with Canada with respect to the important sockeye salmon fisheries of the Fraser River is being negotiated.

#### GREAT BENEFITS TO THE COUNTRY

The foregoing is but a brief résumé of the far-flung activities of the Bureau of Fisheries and the high character of its leadership. This service is on nature's firing line, attempting to restore the great resources which past generations have wantonly wasted. It is of great service to the Nation, because it assures a continuance of the supply of this necessary food at a low price. It is of service to mankind because it induces youth and men and women of all ages to get out into the open and draw from nature physical strength and mental poise. This makes for a happy, contented people whose judgment on civic matters is bettered by their contact with nature. [Applause.]

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to ask for a change in the Calendar Wednesday business next week, in order to convenience certain Members. So far as I know the change will inconvenience no one. I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business for next Wednesday be in order on Friday of next week in lieu of Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that next week, Calendar Wednesday business shall be in order on Friday in lieu of Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS. Reserving the right to object, as I understand, the Rivers and Harbors Committee will have the call on next Calendar Wednesday?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. If the exchange is made it is the expectation that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will call up their bill on Friday of next week. This will give the Members two days more to study the bill. So far as I know this will not delay the final passage of the bill; that is, the time it will become a law.

Mr. BRIGGS. Reserving the right to object, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will have another Calendar Wednesday call, will it not?

Mr. TILSON. The committee will have the following Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, with reference to the request made by the gentleman from Connecticut, there was a somewhat binding understanding had a few days ago about the action of the Rivers and Harbors Committee on Wednesday. Certain assurances were given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] to the minority leader with reference to that bill. Does the proposal of the gentleman from Connecticut in any way set aside that tentative agreement?

Mr. TILSON. As I understand, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] does not consider that the proposed exchange will in any way vitiate the arrangement referred to, and I understand further that he is not unwilling to have this arrangement made.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman from Connecticut has consulted with the minority leader, Mr. GARNER?

Mr. TILSON. I have not consulted with him directly, but another Member has consulted the gentleman and has so informed me.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And the gentleman is informed that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] has no objection?

Mr. TILSON. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If it does not interfere with the views of the minority leader, I shall not interpose any objection.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] has so informed me, and I should not have made the request had I not been so informed.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 328. An act for the relief of Edward C. Dunlap; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 485. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal reserve act and section 5240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.



S. 670. An act for the relief of Charles E. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 968. An act for the relief of Anna Faceina; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1696. An act for the relief of Thomas L. Lindley, minor son of Frank B. Lindley; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1955. An act for the relief of the Maddux Air Lines (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2113. An act to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Federal laws for promotion of vocational agriculture; to the Committee on Education.

S. 2189. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2354. An act to amend the agricultural marketing act so as to include dip or crude gum; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2465. An act for the relief of C. A. Chitwood; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2605. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal reserve act to permit State member banks of the Federal Reserve System to establish or retain branches in foreign countries or in dependencies or insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2788. An act for the relief of A. R. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2865. An act granting the consent of Congress to compact or agreements between the States of Wyoming and Idaho with respect to the boundary line between said States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3284. An act for the relief of the Buck Creek Oil Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3301. An act for the relief of Hunter P. Mulford; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3541. An act to amend section 22 of the Federal reserve act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3627. An act to amend the Federal reserve act so as to enable national banks voluntarily to surrender the right to exercise trust powers and to relieve themselves of the necessity of complying with the laws governing banks exercising such powers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3664. An act for the relief of T. B. Cowper; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3665. An act for the relief of Vida T. Layman; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3666. An act for the relief of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co., Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3774. An act to amend the United States mining laws applicable to the national forests within the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

S. 3817. An act to facilitate and simplify national-forest administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 3934. An act granting certain lands to the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4079. An act to amend section 4 of the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution to provide for the naming of a prominent mountain or peak within the boundaries of Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, in honor of Carl Ben Eielson; to the Committee on the Territories.

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution authorizing the settlement of the case of United States against the Sinclair Crude Oil Purchasing Co. pending in the United States District Court in and for the District of Delaware; to the Committee on Claims.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 9442. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make engineering and economic investigations and studies of conditions in Palo Verde and Cibola Valleys and vicinity on the Colorado River, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10173. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations of cotton ginning.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 686. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; and

S. 3473. An act to amend the act of Congress approved March 16, 1926, establishing a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on April 15, 1930, present to the President for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution providing for the observance and commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of the Monongahela and establishing a commission to be known as the United States Battle of the Monongahela Commission.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 17, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, April 17, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

##### COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

(10 a. m.)

To consider various bills.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2

(10 a. m.)

To amend section 22, Title II, of the national prohibition act, to provide for citation by publication, to relieve congestion of the courts, and for other purposes (H. R. 9563).

##### COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend the act entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes," approved May 15, 1928 (H. R. 8879).

##### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide that certain laws of the United States shall not apply to Indians and Indian reservations within the State of New York (H. R. 9720).

##### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider general legislation.

##### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOSPITALS

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider proposals for veterans' hospitals in Pennsylvania.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 11432. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds," approved March 4, 1929, relating to the condemnation of land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARE: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11239. A bill to extend the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 43, sec. 1171), as amended, to coal lands in Alabama; without amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 9370. A bill to provide for the modernization of the United States Naval Observatory at Washington, D. C., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CLARK of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1761. A bill for the relief of John L. Friel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOX: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3945. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Iannacone; with amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SIMMS: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1469. An act to quitclaim certain lands in Santa Fe County, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOPER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 7874. A bill to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of date November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 9058. A bill for the relief of F. A. Brady (Inc.) (Rept. No. 1187). Laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 11697) to provide for the settlement of claims of citizens of the United States against the Republic of Mexico which have been or may be allowed by the General Claims Commission or Special Claims Commission, United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 11698) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11699) to add certain lands to the Zion National Park in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11700) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mahoning River at or near Cedar Street, Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11701) to promote the maintenance and stabilization of the channels of navigable streams of the United States, to promote commerce between the several States, to protect the post roads, to protect the Federal highways for military purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 11702) to provide for the establishment and development of American air transport services overseas, to encourage construction in the United States by American capital of American airships and other aircrafts for use in foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 11703) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Olean, N. Y., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Olean, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATRES: A bill (H. R. 11704) to amend the air mail act of February 2, 1925, as amended by the acts of June 3, 1926, and May 17, 1928, further to encourage commercial aviation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOPE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 307) authorizing the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, of not to exceed \$300,000 of the amount of \$600,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, by section 12 of the migratory bird conservation act of February 18, 1929; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) to provide for a survey of existing hospital facilities in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOX: A bill (H. R. 11705) granting a pension to Samuel Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11706) granting an increase of pension to Anna Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 11707) for the relief of Maria Maykovic; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 11708) granting a pension to Mary E. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11709) granting an increase of pension to James D. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11710) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 11711) for the relief of George E. Casey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 11712) for the relief of John L. Summers, disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 11713) for the relief of Francis L. Gould; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 11714) granting a pension to Ola M. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11715) granting an increase of pension to Malvina M. Hurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11716) granting an increase of pension to Alice V. Kirk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 11717) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Hood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6789. By Mr. COLTON: Petition signed by a number of citizens of Mount Pleasant, Utah, urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6790. Also, petition signed by a large number of citizens of Salt Lake City, Utah, urging the speedy consideration and passage of the bill (H. R. 2562) providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6791. Also, petition signed by citizens of Eureka, Utah, indorsing the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6792. Also, petition signed by certain citizens of the city of Logan, Utah, urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6793. Also, petition signed by certain citizens of Green River, Utah, urging the passage of House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

6794. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of Local Union No. 944, of Enid, Okla., in support of House bill 10343; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6795. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of G. W. McQueen, of Fort Worth, Tex., indorsing House bill 6603, Kendall 44-hour week bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6796. Also, petition of Local No. 730, N. F. P. O. C., Sadie Hammett, secretary, Corsicana, Tex., indorsing House bill 6603, Kendall 44-hour week bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6797. By Mr. LOZIER: Petition of 180 citizens of Chariton County, Mo., praying for the enactment of the Robison-Capper bill to establish a national department of public education; to the Committee on Education.

6798. By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: Petition of citizens of Moniteau County, Mo., urging speedy consideration and passage of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562; to the Committee on Pensions.

6799. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of M. English and 30 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging passage of House bill 2562, providing an adequate pension for the men who served in the Spanish-American War and the incident insurrections; to the Committee on Pensions.

6800. By Mr. STONE: Petition of 115 residents of May, Okla., in support of House bill 9233; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6801. By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of Robert H. Antrim et al., of Madison County, Ind., relative to pension legislation; to the Committee on Pensions.



6802. By Mr. WOLVERTON of West Virginia: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Huntington, W. Va., recommending favorable action of Congress on providing adequate and just compensation to the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, April 17, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, source of our being, goal of our desires, and guide of these our pilgrim days, be with us now as we turn aside from the ceaseless fret of life that we may contemplate its meaning. In the fullness of the times Thou didst gather Thy light into life, that even simple folk might see Thy glory in the face of Jesus Christ.

Grant, therefore, to each one of us that, from His gracious words, the deep compassion of His heart, His friendship for the fallen, the tender grace of His forgiveness, the crown of thorns, the cruel cross, the open shame, we may learn the meaning of Thy love and be persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, April 14, 1930, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## SENATORIAL EXPENSES IN 1930 CAMPAIGN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair makes the following announcement:

The Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] to succeed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRIGHAM] on the special committee to investigate expenditures of candidates for the United States Senate in the campaign of 1930.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2757) to authorize the United States Shipping Board to sell certain property of the United States situated in the city of Hoboken, N. J., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7405) to provide for a 5-year construction and maintenance program for the United States Bureau of Fisheries, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AIRPLANE ACCIDENT AT MENEFFEE FIELD, NEW ORLEANS, LA. (S. DOC. NO. 129)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting, in response to Senate Resolution 201, data in relation to the airplane accident of August 23, 1929, wherein one Elliot D. Coleman, Jr., a Transoceanic Air Travel Flying School student at Meneffee Field, New Orleans, La., was killed when his plane and the plane of another pilot collided, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

## PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the petition of Frederick Reis, of Compton, Calif., praying that the Government render him financial assistance in the matter of completing his invention, being an invention in the nature of a combination airplane and Zeppelin in a monoplane type, which, with the accompanying paper and diagram, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3466) for the relief of the Searcy Water Co., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 446) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which were referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5283) to declare valid the title to certain Indian lands (Rept. No. 447); and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the use of tribal funds belonging to the Yankton Sioux Tribe of Indians

in South Dakota to pay expenses and compensation of the members of the tribal business committee for services in connection with their pipestone claim (Rept. No. 448).

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3581) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States for the education, medical attention, and relief of distress of Indians, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 449) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3553) for the relief of R. A. Ogee, sr., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 450) thereon.

Mr. PINE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4140) providing for the sale of the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Oklahoma, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 455) thereon.

Mr. DALE, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 10340) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Calico Rock, Ark. (Rept. No. 451); and

A bill (H. R. 10474) granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the White River at or near Sylamore, Ark. (Rept. No. 452).

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3407) for the relief of Judson Stokes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 454) thereon.

Mr. WATERMAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3527) to authorize credit in the disbursing accounts of certain officers of the Army of the United States for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 456) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 26) for the acquisition, establishment, and development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 458) thereon.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1721) directing the retirement of acting assistant surgeons of the United States Navy at the age of 64 years, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 457) thereon.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1683) for the relief of John Heffron (Rept. No. 453);

A bill (H. R. 5726) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the city of Salem, Mass., and to the Salem Marine Society, of Salem, Mass., the silver service set and bronze clock, respectively, which have been in use on the cruiser *Salem* (Rept. No. 459);

A bill (H. R. 6645) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the president of the Lions Club, of Shelbyville, Tenn., a bell of any naval vessel that is now, or may be, in his custody; and to the president of the Rotary Club, of Shelbyville, Tenn., a steering wheel of any naval vessel that is now, or may be, in his custody (Rept. No. 460);

A bill (H. R. 8973) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Charleston Museum, of Charleston, S. C., the ship's bell, plaque, war record, and silver service of the cruiser *Charleston* that is now, or may be, in his custody (Rept. No. 461); and

A bill (H. R. 10674) authorizing payment of six months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty (Rept. No. 462).

## INVESTIGATION OF SALES OF UNITED STATES SHIPS

Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 129) for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the sales of ships by the United States Shipping Board and Merchant Fleet Corporation, reported it with an amendment.